DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 280 SO 020 254

AUTHOR Lineberry, Robert L.
TITLE Consultants' Report of Political Science Programs in the State University System of Florida.
INSTITUTION State Univ. System of Florida, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE Aug 88
NOTE 127p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Assessment; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Political Science; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *State University System of Florida

ABSTRACT

A group of external consultants conducted a review of the political science programs at the institutions within the state university system of Florida and made recommendations based on their findings. Their research focused on three questions: (1) How well does the department integrate itself into the university's mission? (2) How well does the department's research mission both reflect and lead research within the discipline? (3) How effective is the department's teaching program, including the graduate and undergraduate curriculum, the student advising procedures, student morale, student success rate, and cooperation with other teaching activities of the university? Systemwide overviews are provided in the areas of graduate education, undergraduate education, faculties, facilities, and support services. Recommendations are made concerning staffing, departmental organization, curriculum, faculty development, and mission. An examination of individual schools is also presented with specific recommendations for each. Six appendices contain information on the consultants and coordinators, tables detailing degrees offered and degree productivity, and site visit schedules. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313280

POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CAROL WADE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

AUGUST, 1988

SO 020 254

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consultants Report
of
Political Science Programs
in the
State University System of Florida

Dr. Robert L. Lineberry
University of Kansas

Accepted by the Board of Regents on May 12, 1988

BOR 88-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 3

SYSTEMWIDE RECOMMENDATIONS. 11

INTRODUCTION..... 13

TOWARD 2000 IN POLITICAL SCIENCE..... 14

POLITICAL SCIENCE IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA..... 19

GRADUATE EDUCATION IN POLITICAL SCIENCE..... 23
Ph.D. Level Graduate Education..... 23
M.A. Level Graduate Education..... 28

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN POLITICAL SCIENCE IN SUS..... 34

FACULTIES..... 38

FACILITIES AND SUPPORT SERVICES..... 41

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION..... 43

SUMMARY OF GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS..... 44

REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS..... 47

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University..... 47
Florida State University..... 52
Florida Atlantic University..... 55
University of West Florida..... 59
University of North Florida..... 65
Florida International University..... 70
University of Florida..... 74
University of Central Florida..... 82
University of South Florida..... 85

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS..... 90

APPENDICES..... 93
Appendix A. University Coordinators..... 95
Appendix B. Local Consultants..... 99
Appendix C. Site Visit Schedules..... 103
Appendix D. Degree Inventory 115
Appendix E. Degree Productivity.....119
Appendix F. Vita..... 123

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The consultants wish to thank many individuals in the SUS office and at the nine campuses for having made our visits pleasant, informative and, we hope, valuable to the SUS and the individual faculties and administrations.

At the System Office, Dr. Roy McTarnaghan, Dr. Angela Lupo-Anderson and Dr. James Ammons were at all times a source of wise counsel, courteous and professional attention, and assistance in delicate logistics. Our closest contact, of course, was with Dr. Ammons, whose good sense and often good directions we much admired. All of the consultants are thankful to him for his aid and assistance in every matter. We are deeply indebted to the good offices of these several colleagues.

In the universities, the local coordinators were unflagging in their attention to detail. Enormous effort and hundreds of person-hours went into the preparations of reports, facts, and figures. All of the reports we reviewed were accurate and up-to-date. All provided ample grist for our consultative mill. In addition, department chairs and university administrators were generous with their time and thoroughly professional in the process. We were especially impressed with several university presidents and many university vice presidents who made time from their busy schedules to visit with us about their institutions and their political science departments. (We once suggested, only half-seriously, that the quality of a political science program could best be determined by the quantity of time the central administration spent with us.)

While we agree with one SUS officer who described this review process as "grueling," it has been made easier by the large number of men and women

of good will who assisted us.

The lead consultant wishes to record as well a special debt to the colleagues selected by the schools as local consultants. Such an assemblage, if put together, would rank as one of the best political science departments in America. To each of them, the lead consultant as well as the Board and the institutions owe a deep thanks. Most of the words associated with particular schools are theirs, edited primarily to insure consistency in standards and language across the nine schools. Each has been a zealous proponent of high standards in political science. Working with each was a pleasure.

At the same time, it is important to record disclaimers. Each local consultant was responsible for his or her own school. The lead consultant is primarily responsible for this final report. Some of our university consultants may well disagree with the tenor of the report here. While they saw a penultimate draft of the report, they did not see the final draft we present here. We wish to let them off the hook by accepting responsibility for the report as a whole.

As we reflect upon our report, with all its imperfections, the matter which strikes us most is this: it is addressed to multiple constituencies. Political scientists, BOR staff, central administrations, deans, students, and, of course, the Board itself, will pay some heed to our report. Political scientists will understand the idea of multiple constituencies. Our consultants hope that there is a message here for all these constituencies.

Robert L. Lineberry,

for the consulting team

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Political Science: Toward the Year 2000

As an academic discipline, political science studies "the authoritative allocation of values for society as a whole" (David Easton) or "who gets what when how (Harold Lasswell)." The intellectual roots of political science are old indeed, making it one of the oldest academic disciplines. At most institutions in the United States, it is a core liberal arts discipline, typically ranking as one of the three or four largest undergraduate majors. In most institutions, it is vital, too, to general education programs. Graduate-level programs in political science lead to the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. Although there was an excess of supply over demand for a decade or two, evidence indicates that the 1990s will show a national shortage of Ph.D.'s in political science.

Today, political science is a discipline with common concerns about subjects of citizenship, democratic and authoritarian governance, war and peace, and leadership. More and more, there are important linkages to economics and other disciplines through the study of public policy and political economy. The principal sub-disciplines in political science include (1) American government and politics; (2) comparative politics; (3) international relations; (4) political theory; (5) public law, and, an area which is sometimes included inside and sometimes outside political science, (6) public administration. More departments are explicitly opening programs in public policy and political economy.

Political Science and the SUS

Consultants were very impressed with the organization and governance of the SUS. Clearly, a decision was made many years ago, as the State was beginning to grow, that Florida would not yield to pressure for a "university on every street corner." This has enabled the SUS to concentrate resources wisely, producing nine very strong campuses, at least in so far as political science is concerned. We were concerned that this strength of the SUS may be dissipated when branch campuses are opened and off-campus programs delivered essentially by pirating resources from existing programs.

Our overall assessment is that political science in Florida is not as strong as political science in other state systems, notably California. At the same time, the smallest and the weakest in Florida are very good indeed. The quality of the non-Ph.D. schools was generally impressive. Each school within the SUS may have a specific strength -- Central Florida in technological education, FAU in growth management, FIU in international and Latin American Studies, for example. Often, departments within schools have not fully "played to the strength" of their individual schools.

Of course, there is a strong reliance on the community college system. Courses are like-numbered; transfer is easy. Our only concern about this reliance on the community colleges is that it has deflected attention at the senior institutions from general education programs. Few departments seem to see their general education role as critical though there are some exceptions.

Although our views of political science within the SUS are generally positive, there is unevenness in development across the schools. Nowhere is this more evident than in graduate education.

Graduate Education in Political Science

All schools but two (FIU and FAMU) offer or participate in regular graduate degree programs. Faculty members at FIU and FAMU participate in interdisciplinary programs. Two schools (FSU and UF) offer Ph.D. degrees. Graduate education in political science in the SUS is, at best, uneven. This is the greatest single barrier at the moment to realizing the BOR goal to make this one of the top four or five systems in the country, at least as far as political science is concerned.

Ph.D. Level Education in the SUS. The strongest component of graduate education in the SUS, of course, is the graduate program at FSU. It is a nationally regarded program, well-recognized by almost any measure of departmental quality, strong in American politics and comparative politics, with ancillary strength in public policy. From an SUS point of view, the most logical thing to do to strengthen graduate education in the State of Florida would be to put significant new energies into the Ph.D. program at FSU. This could bring the program into the ranks of a "top ten," perhaps a "top five" department.

By contrast, surely the greatest concern at the level of graduate education is the perilous condition of the Ph.D. program at the University of Florida. It has produced only 6 Ph.D.'s in as many years. There are emerging signs that both the department and the administration are concerned about this problem and intend to address it, though very belatedly.

There is also talk of additional Ph.D. programs in political science within the SUS. The Miami area, for example, must surely be the largest metropolitan area in the U.S. with no private or public institution offering

a Ph.D. degree in political science. At the same time, because there is little if any local market for Ph.D.s in political science, it is difficult to see how this crimps the economic development of the Miami metropolitan area.

In our opinion, the State of Florida does not need an additional Ph.D. program in political science. We strongly urge the BOR to strengthen existing programs rather than place another one on the books. Individually, probably the best-equipped school to offer additional graduate level work (and, ironically, one which offers none now) is FIU.

M.A. Level Graduate Education. Elsewhere, graduate level training in political science needs major rethinking.

The M.A.S.S. program at FAMU is a troubling one to us, at least. These consultants agree with the Social Science consultants (in their report of August 19, 1987) that this program has "cannibalized" resources from the constituent units. We urge that resources, rather than promises of resources or request for resources, be made available to support political science participation in this program.

In the other, non-Ph.D. schools, there is a familiar story ringing repeatedly like a church bell: (1) enrollments in M.A. courses are small, often getting smaller; (2) the number of students is not often of critical mass level; (3) the quality of students seems uneven; (4) undersized graduate classes are taught alongside oversized undergraduate classes. We are recommending drastic rethinking of the M.A. level programs on all campuses.

No less than one third of the schools in the SUS have tried to rescue flagging M.A. programs by programs in "practical politics" or "political campaigning." We find the programs at FSU and UF to be imaginative, and

rest on certain strengths within the universities. They need to be complementary, instead of competing. We have grave reservations about the program at UWF, which does not, in our opinion, cohere within an ethical context appropriate to our discipline or the University.

Undergraduate Education in SUS

Every local consultant was more than impressed with the calibre of undergraduate education in the SUS schools. Faculty were typically dedicated to this task. The payoffs seemed excellent. Students throughout the system spoke well of their undergraduate experiences and are a source of pride to faculties.

The weakness of undergraduate education in SUS is the relative weakness of general education programs at Florida state universities. We find too little effort in Florida institutions to conceptualize the role of political science in general education. This may be in part a weakness of the system in general, and not reflecting upon political science in particular.

Nor were we overly impressed with institutions' and departments' efforts in teacher education and honors programs. Nor did there seem to be systematic programs available to increase the numbers of, and be more attentive to the needs of, minority students.

Faculties

In general, we found the faculties at SUS institutions strong and dedicated. While there are real morale problems, in varying degrees of seriousness, at FAU, UF, FSU, and USF, the faculties as a whole were strong and cohesive. We were quite unclear about why teaching loads vary so much

in seemingly comparable schools. These uneven loads are a puzzle to us because they seem unrelated to any obvious features of the schools, or even to research productivity.

Facilities and Support Services

In general, our view of facilities in SUS schools is "not bad." The older campuses are crowded, but attractive. The newer campuses are often magnificent, but seem crowded because of recent growth in most schools. Library facilities seem, for the most part, appropriate to the missions of the schools. Computer facilities are not as good as they should be. Support for faculty activities seems in most places minuscule, although we have no reason to believe that political science is singled out for such shortchanging.

Reports on Individual Schools

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University. Our evidence suggests that FAMU well merits its reputation as the strongest historically black public institution. Its faculty is small, dedicated, and weighed down by an almost incredible burden of providing graduate and undergraduate education. Its teaching loads are high even compared to other SUS schools. We are recommending that political science participation in the MASS program be either phased out or adequately funded by the institution.

Florida State University. FSU has one of the nation's better departments of political science. The faculty and graduate program are strong, and adequate attention is given to undergraduate matters. One concern is that the program seems to dissipate much energy into conflict with central

administration. The department is probably better than the resource commitment would predict.

Florida Atlantic University. Once one of the nation's premier young political science departments, the department at FAU has lived in the shadow of a "Golden Age." Some of its internal decisions have not supported the department well. It struggles with a weak graduate program -- not atypical of SUS schools --but its undergraduate program is strong.

University of West Florida. UWF has a strong faculty and a clear commitment to quality undergraduate education. We admire the energy and initiative of this department, but we caution against continuing the present "practical politics" focus at the M.A. level. Energies could better be devoted to other aspects of graduate and undergraduate programming, in which the present strong faculty can be critical.

University of North Florida. Although this department exists within an organizational context which might be an administrative nightmare, the faculty seems to have a clear conception of its mission. It has, too, a good sense of the role of political science in general education. It needs to have a stronger offering in the areas of political economy and public policy, which would fit well within current departmental themes.

Florida International University. Here is a real strength of the SUS. While there is some legitimate concern about being pushed further off-campus, there is a core of good faculty here. Many of them think of themselves as offering a "Swarthmore model" of high calibre undergraduate education. Many students here seem to share an almost electric intellectual excitement with the faculty.

University of Florida. The University of Florida has a small faculty in relationship to the size of the College and the University. This is the source of some, but not all, of the difficulties with this program. Undergraduate students, for example, find it easier to enroll as seniors in "gateway" courses than as freshmen because they get first pick at enrollment time. The graduate program has languished. It may be encouraging that the department and the administration are seeking ways to restore political science to a position as one of the 25 best departments in the country. This program needs serious attention by the administration of the institution.

University of Central Florida. Political science, as a strong program, plays a key role in this heavily technological institution. The faculty there is strong and students are apparently well-served by their education. As in many SUS schools, there are understandable concerns about the calibre of the graduate program, and whether it detracts from the undergraduate programs.

University of South Florida. While USF is a difficult school for the outsider to assess, it is clear that the department exhibits some of the strengths and weaknesses of the school as a whole. Dispersed over five campuses, with 19 units reporting to the Dean of Social Sciences, it would be hard to imagine that USF's somewhat chaotic nature would not impress itself on the political science department. Partly for this reason, morale in the department is low. We address a number of specific recommendations to the faculty and the administration regarding this state of affairs.

SYSTEMWIDE RECOMMENDATIONS

Here follows our most general recommendations for the SUS and the Universities regarding political science in the next five years.

1. Additional investments in graduate education at the strongest schools should be encouraged.
2. Departments should be discouraged by administrations from dissipating graduate programs at off-campus locations.
3. The "political campaigns" focus should be encouraged at UF and FSU and discontinued in its present form at UWF. The programs should be closely coordinated to prevent duplicaitons.
4. The MASS program at FAMU should not expect political science participation unless resources can be made quickly available to the department or the program
5. Undergraduate programs at the institutions should be continued in their present forms. At the same time,
   a. Departments should be asked to prepare documents related to "Political Science and General Education." This should include attention to the role of political science and general education in a multicultural state.
   b. All departments should increase their participation in Honors programs.
   c. All departments should increase their participation in teacher education programs.
6. There needs to be more focus in the programs at the non-Ph.D. schools. Each department should maintain its traditional strength in basic areas

of political science, but each should select one or two thematic emphases in which it can distinguish itself nationally and regionally. Some schools have such plans well underway. These themes should be logically related to missions of the respective schools.

7. Departments should dramatically increase their information about and contact with one another. Regular meetings among chairs would be one suggestion.

8. Through the SUS, attention needs to be given to improving facilities and support services for political science which, it should be emphasized, may not be worse off than other disciplines.

9. There needs to be a concerted, system-wide as well as school-wide, effort to increase the numbers of, and retention of, minority students and faculties. Specifically,

   a. Administrations and the SUS should consider rewarding departments with exceptional efforts in this area with additional resources.

   b. Faculty exchanges, minority post-doctoral, and other innovations should be considered by SUS and school administrations.

INTRODUCTION

There is no other discipline than ours which studies carefully the ways by which mankind can end itself through its own choices, the whys and wherefores of democratic and totalitarian governments, and the reasons why governments in this and other societies allocate a third or more of their gross national products to public tasks. Political science, as an academic discipline, has grown in importance as governments have grown in importance in the modern world. Typically, in our nation's universities, political science will be among the three or four largest majors within the university. As an academic discipline, it is an important one. As a subject matter for study, few matters shape our next generation on this planet as much as government.

This report reviews political science as an academic discipline in the State University System of Florida. The SUS is a constellation of nine campuses, three very old indeed and six very new. There is a clear aspiration in the Board and the SUS to make this into one of the top five university systems in the country; given the resources of the State of Florida the clear-headed management of the system office and the strength of faculties, this seems to be a realizable goal.

Our purpose in this report is to assess political science in this system. There are many standards, some no doubt competing, against which we judge the success of political science in the SUS. Admitting that all universities perform research, teaching, and service roles, we need standards more specific by which to evaluate the contributions of various programs, all existing in institutions whose missions may be different.

There seems to be consensus among the consultants and among the schools and departments themselves that the following questions are those best asked about political science programs:

1. How well does the department integrate itself into the university's mission? How does it play both a role as an "arm" of a discipline nationally and yet tailor its programs to accomplish some larger purpose within its own institutional milieu?
2. How well does the department's research mission both reflect and lead research within the discipline of political science? Is research mutually supportive within a department? Is it well integrated into the teaching mission?
3. How effective is the department's teaching program, including its graduate and undergraduate curriculum, its advising, its rapport with students, the subsequent success rate of its students, and its participation in other teaching activities of the university, such as teacher education and honors education?

TOWARD 2000 IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

As an academic discipline, political science studies what David Easton once called "the authoritative allocation of values for society as a whole" or what Harold D. Lasswell once called "who gets what when how." The intellectual strands of political science are old indeed, making it one of the oldest academic disciplines. Aristotle and Plato contributed much to early political philosophy. English, French, Italian, German, and American

theorists through the centuries examined issues of the state, power, republicanism, democracy, and citizenship.

Political science is thus and old and a new discipline. In the United States, it began really in the late 1800s, tied closely to history, but also reformist in its orientation. A "science" of politics was often thought of as a remedy to the ills inflicted by man upon himself. Prescriptive, hortatory, and sometimes self-righteous, political science was a "Progressive" discipline in more ways than one. Political scientists advocated municipal reforms like the city manager plan; internationally, they advocated international organizations; nationally, they advocated primary elections and railed against corruption and machines.

The 1950s and 1960s brought about what we call the "behavioral revolution" in political science. This revolution was intellectually positivist, methodologically empirical, politically pluralist, and disciplinarily oriented more toward sociology and psychology than toward history and law. The generation of political science leaders now ascendent in the profession were products of this "behavioral revolution." Empirical studies of voting behavior were a mainstay of the behavioral methodology. Quantitative studies of political phenomena -- UN voting records, electoral choice, state government expenditures, tolerance toward civil liberties, congressional voting records -- were dominant.

One famous article in 1964 celebrated the "end of ideology" in American politics, after a book of that name became widely read. Events, however, intruded upon this judgement. In fact, the events of the 1960s and 1970s caused considerable introspection within political science. A "value-neutral" discipline was held in lower regard. Thus, the last decade has

been more a period of ferment within political science. New disciplinary concerns -- public policy analysis and political economy are two examples -- have come to take places alongside "political behavior" as subjects of disciplinary research.

Political science has recently placed major emphasis on these two approaches to the discipline, political economy and public policy. Political economy is the intellectual link between political science and economics. Actually it is a fairly general term covering like a tent several disparate activities. Some political economists adopt the assumptions and methods of economists and apply them to political phenomena, e.g., voting, committee behavior, or the link between economic cycles and electoral cycles. Departments such as Rochester and Cal Tech are especially strong in this area. Others who are political economists draw more heavily from a European intellectual tradition, working on class analysis, sociospatial relationships, and critical theory. Departments such as Chicago are good in this area (and UNF is developing a respectable program there, too). Clearly there will be more attention to political economy by the year 2000. This is true on the international and comparative sides of our disciplines as well as the American side. Studies of the world political economy are important ones, because trade relations and issues of "competitiveness" are important to our nation's future.

Public policy analysis is another growth stock in political science. It studies the policy decisions of government, governmental budgeting, implementation of public programs, policy evaluation, and domestic and cross-national studies of policy areas, e.g., health, transportation, education, and so forth. More and more departments have graduate or undergraduate

concentrations in the public policy field. FSU has a nationally-recognized policy sciences program as well.

Clearly, there are other areas in which political science is likely to grow in the next 10-15 years. Surely one of them is in the area of biology and politics. Advances in biomedical and biochemical areas will have enormous implications for politics, law, and public policy, not to mention ethics. The ethics of these matters are now only in their infancy, and political scientists, with their long-standing competence in political theory and ethics, can make a major intellectual impact here. This is a part of a larger set of issues related to the politics and policy of technology, an area in which UCF seems to be developing some expertise in the area of space.

These are not, of course, the only developments which will shape political science by the beginning of the next century. Like other disciplines, we will be challenged to deliver more technologically sophisticated education of our students, relying more heavily upon computers and telecommunications. Issues of teacher training will cause political science to study more carefully the role of politics in education in the public school. Reports on A Nation at Risk and College challenge all faculties to be more attentive to the educational and learning processes and not merely to the transmission of disciplinary knowledge.

Today, political science is a constellation of sub-disciplines linked by several common themes. One of those themes, and perhaps the most important, is the relationship between man and the state. Everywhere people relate to the state through political institutions, including executives, courts, and legislatures. Some of these relationships, political scientists

call "democratic;" some they call "authoritarian." The wellsprings of democratic government -- parties, groups, civil liberties, and free elections -- are a central part of all political analysis, and of all political science departments.

Political scientists also study how nations relate to one another, whether in war or peace. Linked ever more closely by economics and by the potential for self-destructive war, nations are an important, but not the only, building block of world order and disorder. When political scientists study politics in other nations, they often compare one nation to others, whether to understand comparative health policies or comparative party systems.

In most departments, the major fields of the discipline are these:

- o American politics. This is typically the largest part of a department, numerically at least. Every strong department has a core of faculty in the areas of American political institutions (Congress, the presidency, the courts, parties and groups), political behavior (voting and participation) and American public policy. The good political science department may have 40-50 percent of its faculty strength in the American government and politics field.
- o Comparative politics. This is typically another large part of departmental energies. Some comparative politics specialists are "area studies" specialists, working in Latin America, or western Europe, or Asia, or whatever. Others are more generally comparative.

- International relations. This is a part of the discipline specializing in the relations among nations. Studies of war and peace, international organization, international economics, and international economic development are important parts of this important field.
- Political theory. This is the oldest part of the discipline, anchoring its roots in the great political thinkers from Aristotle to Madison and Marx, but also drawing upon a resurgent attention to values in the political and other realms. This is the part of political science most closely associated with renewed attention to ethical dimensions of public life.
- Public law. In many places, this is a part of the American field, but it sometimes stands freely as one of the several sub-fields of political science.
- Public administration. In some, though not all, departments, political science includes public administration. It can be said -- and will be said below -- that there are no hard-and-fast guidelines about the relations between public administration and political science.

POLITICAL SCIENCE IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

The SUS may or may not be a national treasure, but it is certainly a state one, and one much to be admired from the outside. Clearly, a decision was made many years ago, as the state was beginning to grow, that Florida

would not yield to pressure for a "university on every street corner." It is impressive to us that the SUS contains, in a very large state indeed, fewer universities than does the University of Texas system, and only twice as many universities as the University of Houston system alone. This has permitted the SUS to concentrate resources wisely, building nine very strong universities, if political science programs are any measure.

Our overall assessment is that the SUS does not yet have as strong a set of programs in political science as do some other state systems, notably the California system. And yet this may be within reach. A careful study might reveal that other systems -- Texas and North Carolina, for example -- were better overall than the Florida system. At the same time, the smallest and the weakest in Florida are very good indeed, in contrast to most other states. The quality of the "regional" schools, i.e., the non-Ph.D. schools, was exceptional. The State of Florida has, in the opinion of your consultants, not dissipated its resources into mediocre institutions with mediocre programs. Rather, the State of Florida has chosen to concentrate its resources on nine strong institutions with nine strong programs. This is a theme to which we constantly return in this report.

There is in Florida a strong reliance on the community college system, producing what one administrator called a "diamond" model of university enrollments. Typical is an enrollment in which upper-division students are the largest in numbers. Courses are like-numbered. Transfer is easy. Some departments have very strong relations with their community college colleagues. Only in Dade county, and among students, did we hear concerns expressed about the calibre of community college education.

Developing in a generally orderly manner, we nonetheless see the SUS as pushed somewhat by the inevitable tendency to offer what one of our consultants called the "burger king" model of the university: have it your way, one on every corner. On the one hand, there is a sincere desire of departments and administrations to meet the needs of students across a community or a region; some students are indeed "place bound," to use a word one hears more than once in Florida schools. On the other hand, the historic philosophy of the SUS is that resources will be wisely concentrated, and not widely dispersed.

Some of the SUS institutions seem more destined to be in conflict about these roles more than others; one seems to have carried it very far indeed. To us at least, USF seems to be a most fragmented school, doing in miniature what the SUS has resisted at the aggregate level. Our view, of course, is limited by our look at only one discipline.

Nonetheless, we lean toward the philosophy of the SUS. We favor a set of nine real universities. All of us are perhaps old-fashioned enough to believe that universities are places where students go to, rather than place which faculties go to. Community colleges may be places which are on every street corner. Universities are not community colleges. There are balances which will need to be struck as they affect political science. Sometimes tensions exist between political science departments and their administrations about the degree to which programs should be off-campus.

Our consultants, therefore, would reaffirm the basic goals and aspirations of the SUS, particularly as it affects political science. Throughout it is necessary for the SUS and its component schools to be constantly vigilant against proliferating programs to off-campus sites which weaken

on-campus programs. We see this as a problem at most schools with off-campus programs.

We were, though, frankly surprised by the absence of knowledge of one another in the SUS among political science departments and programs. Apparently, three schools have undertaken efforts to create M.A. level emphases on campaigns and elections, each having little knowledge of what the others were doing. We were surprised that some faculty members at FAU had never set foot on the campus of FIU. One recommendation of this report is that department chairs establish regular quarterly meetings, rotating among the schools, to discuss issues of common concern.

Overall, then, we consider political science to be good within the SUS. There are weak spots -- some surprising -- but there are many strong spots, particularly among those campuses which do not first catch the national eye. We doubt that there is a single student in the State of Florida, who, upon choosing political science as a major, will not find a strong program for his or her choosing. We doubt that there is a single student, upon choosing a graduate program, will not be able in this state to find a strong, nationally competitive program available. Universities will be rightly prideful in the nature and qualities of their political science faculties. We find, of course, some anomalies within political science. There are undergraduate programs whose teaching loads are incongruous with other similar programs, and whose research expectations are similar. Programs differ markedly in their ability to attract and nurture minority faculty and students. Morale of faculty differs significantly. Different programs have different emphases, which we find often to be positive.

In general, though, political science is in good shape at the SUS. The purpose of this report is to make it better. A particular emphasis of this report is to focus on how programs can be better within existing resources. Easy it is to report that "program X could be better if the administration spent more money on it." More complex is to report on how existing resources could be better deployed. We will reserve a spot in every report for comments on "if more resources were allocated...." But we place some emphasis on what resources are now used for, and how that might be changed. Often, indeed, our principal recommendation is to leave resources wisely where they are.

There is, however, uneven development among the schools in their political science offerings, even taking into account the varying missions of the several schools. Nowhere is this more evident that in graduate education.

GRADUATE EDUCATION IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

Ph.D. level Graduate Education.

There are two Ph.D. programs in the SUS, one at FSU and the other at the University of Florida. All of the other institutions, either maintain their own M.A. program or participate (as at FAMU and FIU) in an interdisciplinary program. The FAMU program in M.A.S.S. has already been a part of the Social Science Review through the SUS review process, though we will echo those sentiments here.

Graduate education is the capstone of the university experience. It enriches scholarship, brings a new cadre of scholars into the academy, and,

in professional areas, enriches the economy as well. The strongest graduate programs in political science (e.g., those at Michigan, Yale, Berkeley, North Carolina, Minnesota, and Indiana) typically exist with a faculty of 30-50 with a score or two of teaching assistantships and fellowships, modern computer and research facilities, course loads of two courses per semester per faculty, and a strong research mission of the faculty. In these departments, the M.A. degree is typically not seen as an important aspect of the program, being often a way station on the road to a Ph.D. Indeed, the future of M.A. degrees in political science is often problematic. Neither fish nor fowl, it does not have any axiomatic career implication, nor does it provide the rich research experience needed for a research career in the discipline.

Today, having a full-blown cafeteria menu of Ph.D. programs is often a mark of prestige for a university and its community. While it is doubtful that Ph.D. programs in political science provide any obvious benefit to a community economically, since the hiring a Ph.D. in political science takes place in a national, not a local market, there may be certain advantages to having a Ph.D. program. Research may be facilitated; stronger faculty may be easier to attract and retain. There may even be racial or ethnic implications in having Ph.D.-level education. Earlier this year, Hispanic residents of South Texas filed suit against the Texas Coordinating Board because of the paucity of Ph.D. programs in south Texas.

In political science, as in other disciplines, the 1960s were a heyday for graduate education, with supply falling far short of demand. The 1970s and 1980s, presenting tenured phalanxes of faculty members still short of retirement, were another matter. Some schools cut graduate enrollments; others were cut by market and demographic forces. In political science,

again as in other disciplines, the 1990s will see a shortage of graduate students coming through the pipeline in the 1990s, when supply will fall short of demand. Florida has not participated up to its level of capacity in meeting this national demand for Ph.D.s in political science. This alone is an argument for making a major commitment to graduate education in political science in the State.

Graduate education in political science in the SUS is, at best, uneven. This is the greatest single barrier at the moment to realizing the BOR goal to make this one of the top four or five university systems in the country, at least as far as political science is concerned. There is one strong graduate program in the State, at FSU. The rest suffer from one deficiency or another. Let us be more specific.

The strongest part of graduate education in the SUS, of course, is the graduate program at FSU. It is a nationally recognized program, ranked very well by any measure of departmental quality, strong in areas of public policy studies, American politics and comparative politics. It is probably reasonable to conclude that is a "top twenty" department. It is probably not a "top ten" department, but with additional investments, for it is hardly an oversized department, it could be. While we will have some specific suggestions for improvement in this program, the SUS, the University and the department can take real pride in its achievements. But, FSU, in our opinion, has not been able to capture the energies of the department to serve as a university role model. Instead of feeling as if responsibilities for the University were theirs to assume, the FSU department has often assumed that their was a bastion to be guarded. This has shortchanged both the University and the department. We attend to this issue below.

From an SUS point of view, the best strategy for graduate education would be to invest very heavily in additional support for FSU, to bring that program into the ranks of the top ten, perhaps the top five, political science programs. Again, we will be very specific about suggestions here, for the pouring of resources alone does not a first class program make.

By contrast, surely the greatest concern about graduate education in the SUS surrounds the program at the University of Florida. It has produced only six Ph.D.s in six years. In the words of one faculty member, it has "limped along." If it were a Ph.D. at one of the regional schools, one would be tempted to propose that it be eliminated. To do so at the state's largest university, however, would be nearly unthinkable. We will return in many places to this problem. There are encouraging signs that both the department and the administration there are aware of the problems of the program and are taking steps to address them.

Now, there is talk at other institutions of Ph.D. programs. The Miami area, for example, must surely be the largest metropolitan area in the United States without a Ph.D. program in political science at a private or public institution. Indeed, it is ironical that the only department with no M.A. in political science at all is the one in Miami.

In our considered opinion, the State of Florida does not need an additional Ph.D. program in political science. There are two on the books now and resources which might be devoted to building another one from scratch -- for that is where the beginnings would have to be -- could better be spent making excellent and adequate, respectively, the programs at FSU and UF. By the end of a decade, another Ph.D. might be in second gear. But by that point, demand might once again lag for Ph.D.s.

Others, of course, might disagree with our judgement. We will offer the observation that, if another Ph.D. program is established, there is only one school remotely ready to undertake this assignment, i.e., FIU, the school paradoxically with no M.A. level work at all now. One might even speculate that the reason they are better prepared is precisely because they have resisted blandishments to disperse precious energies into marginal graduate work. The only alternative we can see to this is a joint Ph.D. at FAU and FIU. Both individually, though, are far from capable of mounting such an effort in the near future.

We cannot, though, resist quoting the observations of the social sciences panel that "Evidence generated in the evaluations cause consultants to question the wisdom of inter-institutional degree program arrangements (Social Science Review, August 19, 1987, p. 19)." We, too, are skeptical about the wisdom of inter-institutional configurations for Ph.D. programs.

If additional Ph.D. level programs are to be established in the SUS, we recommend that the following resources be available before the program is implemented:

- o A faculty size of 20-25 minimum, with core strength at the senior level in American political behavior and institutions, comparative politics, public policy, international relations, and political theory.
- o A number of graduate Teaching or Research Assistantships, each paying at 1988 costs $7000 annually for half-time work. Probably 10-15 of these are essential.
- o Significant new investments in library resources.
- o A 2-2 teaching load for all research faculty.

o Minimum faculty time investment in off-campus programs.

Even with these resources, opening up an additional Ph.D. program in the SUS would be a chancy proposition. Better, we believe, to strengthen the existing programs at the Ph.D. level.

M.A. Level Graduate Education.

Elsewhere, graduate education in the SUS schools needs some major rethinking.

One troubling place, for example, is FAMU. A tiny, dedicated faculty struggles to maintain a quality undergraduate program there. Resources -- principally faculty time -- are, though, "peeled off" for the M.A.S.S. program. In this connection, it is worth quoting the conclusions of the Social Science Review (August 19, 1987, p. 147f.):

The imposition of a multidisciplinary, graduate program onto disciplinary-based undergraduate degrees is thought best when the latter are operating from a position of strength. To do otherwise places the basic disciplines at risk, with subsequent deleterious effect for the baccalaureate and general education missions. ...Consultants are as one in their concern that this process of cannibalization is underway in the program noted. The demands on faculty are creating serious student/faculty ratio and scheduling problems in undergraduate curricular areas. In fact, consultants estimate, based on experience in their own institutions, that the disciplinary units currently need a minimum of six to eight faculty to bring them into sensible balance to meet program objectives at all levels.

The political science consultants concur wholeheartedly with these observations. Even though we did not directly review the M.A.S.S. program,

it is our clear sense that a risk is being run of weakening a strong undergraduate program for a weak graduate one. Absent additional resources, we recommend at least that political science participation in this program be phased out over a three year period. We do not believe that promises of legislative requests or assurances of internal reallocation alone are sufficient. The problem is a grave and immediate one.

In the other, non-Ph.D. schools, there is a familiar story ringing repeatedly like a church bell: (1) enrollments in graduate offerings at the M.A. level are small, often getting smaller; (2) the number of students is often not of critical mass level [one department once flunked out its entire graduate class in a single seminar]; (3) the quality of students seems uneven; (4) departments thus teach undersized graduate classes while teaching over sized undergraduate classes; (5) little if any financial support is available to graduate students; and, therefore, (6) departments sometimes "scramble" to find new constituencies, e.g., air force bases or new clienteles/or those interested in political campaigning.

No less than one third of the schools in the state of Florida have come up with the same innovative idea for revitalizing M.A. enrollments and meeting a state or national need by developing programs in "practical politics," "applied politics," or "political campaigning." West Florida, FSU and UF are all developing tracks within existing degrees to meet these needs. (We were, though, frankly surprised by their scanty knowledge of one another's programs.) The program at FSU will rely upon the well-developed survey work there; the one at UF will be complemented by FIRE, the Florida Institute for Research on Elections and by the Hamilton archives. These could be very successful programs, even complementing one another. Rather

than sorting out now which will become the stronger program, we recommend that the programs should be reassessed at the next regular review cycle in five years. In the interim, the program directors should coordinate directions so that the programs complement, rather than compete with one another.

We have a different set of concerns about the program at UWF. The department's emphasis on "applied politics" is innovative. But at present, it has, as the local consultant notes, "a narrow, even crabbed, view of what constitutes applied politics... These strengths and weaknesses are most clearly reflected in the M.A. program in campaign management." We were concerned that "the more successful it becomes, the greater the danger that it will detract from the mainstream political science program." We were gravely concerned that the program seems to be utterly inattentive to any ethical dimension of political life. As the local consultant observed "it is frankly shocking to find students who defend political dirty tricks, whose vocabulary so often includes the word 'ruthless,' and who seem so little concerned about any value or objective that can be achieved through a democratic process." We are concerned for the reputation of both the University and the SUS. We feel strongly that this matter needs immediate attention. Our view is that the needs of the State of Florida in this area of campaigns and practical politics can be well served by the emerging programs at UF and FSU and that the program at UWF be phased out or dramatically restructured.

In general, we find that departments at the non-Ph.D. schools are often merely "going through the motions" of running graduate programs. Neither faculties nor administrations have often faced up to the fact that these programs consume scarce resources and detract from what are, in every case,

very strong undergraduate programs. Administrations have not put stipend moneys into graduate programs, and stipend moneys are thin even at the Ph.D. schools. Faculties often support their undergraduate programs ahead of their M.A. programs.

The somewhat bedraggled condition of M.A. education in the non-Ph.D. schools, it should be emphasized, is not of the faculty's making. Nor is it of the administrations' making. There is simply not, for the most part, a reliable market for the M.A. degree in political science (in contradistinction to one in public administration). Were M.A. programs not basically cannibalizing excellent undergraduate programs at virtually every school, we would only mildly concerned. Unfortunately, they are. Our recommendations for the non-Ph.D. schools are as follows:

1. Each department and its administration should frankly discuss the future of M.A. level programs in political science. All should set five-year goals for the programs or decide now to discontinue them. These goals should include attention to (1) the number of full-time and part-time students which would constitute a critical mass; (2) the amount of resources which should be devoted to graduate education at the expense of undergraduate education; (3) how many degrees should be produced annually; (4) how to improve the recruitment and placement of graduate students; (5) what innovations could be worked out in teacher education and reeducation; and (6) whether any particular constituency could be identified as a natural clientele for the program. Goal statements should be filed with the SUS and become a key part of the next cycle of political science reviews.

2. We believe that 2-5 M.A. students should be produced annually to make an M.A. program viable.

3. A specific plan, therefore, should be developed at each institution by the department and the administration regarding M.A. education. When goals and schedules are agreed to, these should be a key part of the next five year review of political science.

4. A department should not be reluctant to propose the abandonment of graduate programming. The decision at FIU not to move to graduate education has served the department well.

5. Further attempts to decentralize off-campus graduate education should be resisted unless resources are specifically earmarked for this purpose, and losses in other areas are openly agreed upon in a "hold harmless" manner.

In short, we recommend very significant rethinking of graduate programs at all the schools. FSU is primed to be a major graduate program within political science. It can chart a path as North Carolina, Michigan or Northwestern once did in the behavioral revolution. UF needs to think about whether it wants to -- as one administrator put it -- "cede the leadership to FSU." All the non-Ph.D. programs need to think, and very seriously, about the future of M.A. level work in political science. Some of them should frankly decide to get out of the business.

As for graduate education generally, the consultants offer the following recommendations to the SUS:

1. For the foreseeable future, resources be concentrated to build even stronger the program at FSU, which can really become a major graduate program in political science during the 1990s.

2. Immediate attention be given by the department and the central administration at UF to the future of the graduate program there. If current recruiting is successful, there will be an opportunity to rebuild a good graduate program which is deeply in need of assistance.

3. At FAMU, participation by the political science department in M.A.S.S. be discontinued after a phasing out period unless additional resources are available for upgrading either the program or the political science department are made available. This phasing out should occur over a three year period.

4. At UF, FSU, and UWF, the programs in "practical politics" should be continued at UF and at FSU, and phased out or radically restructured at UWF. The programs at UF and FSU should work to complement, rather than compete with one another and should develop goals for the next five-year regents review. If the program at UWF is continued, and we have some reservations about this, it should have the strongest possible ethical component available outside current resources. We believe that the present faculty does not have the expertise to provide this ethical dimension.

5. The SUS does not now need any additional Ph.D. programs. It is important now to strengthen existing Ph.D. programs. If an additional program is established, though, it should be at FIU or through cooperative arrangements between FAU and FIU.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN POLITICAL SCIENCE IN THE SUS

Every local consultant was more than impressed with the calibre of undergraduate education in the SUS schools. In an era when graduate education can consume a faculty, when a research grant can count for more than a good freshman course, when a thesis can occupy more faculty time than an entire parties class, we were impressed by the deep dedication to undergraduate education at all the SUS schools. More than the dedication, we were impressed by the payoffs. Students throughout the system spoke of the quality of their education and seemed to be able to articulate in very clear ways how the quality of education was related to the quality of their lives. There is a bond between students and faculty at all of these schools. Central Florida and FIU impressed us mightily in this regard, but they were the A+s in a system of As. Throughout we are impressed by the calibre of upper-level major education in the system.

Our concerns about undergraduate education in Florida relate more to an understandable problem: the relative weakness of general education programs in Florida state universities. The "diamond-shaped model" of Florida education has never impressed upon faculties or administrations the necessity to be attentive to general education requirements or teaching. This is unfortunate. Especially in a multi-ethic state, political science has much to say about citizenship and about leadership.

Our concerns about general education in the SUS are not unique. Interestingly, the social science consultants report that "it is worthy of note that local and lead consultants are as one in finding <u>too little effort in Florida institutions to conceptualize general education models</u> that will

meet contemporary student needs" (Social Science Review, August 19, 1987, p. 11). They report that "it is difficult at best to manage general education in a predominantly 2+2 system (Ibid., p. 12)." We share this general observation, noting that few political science departments have well conceptualized their role in general education, and that few administrations have worked with them effectively to do so.

There are several matters which should be at the forefront of general education, as it affects political science, in the SUS. First, political science has historically played a central role in liberal arts education. Some states (e.g., Texas) actually require political science education in the college curriculum. In the SUS, there is often a "catch-as-catch-can" attitude toward the relationship between political education and general education. Second, political science can be a key education toward citizenship. Even in the academy, opinions are divided upon the work of scholars like Bloom (The Closing of the American Mind) and Hirsch (Cultural Literacy), but both would stress the need for educated men and women to assume special responsibilities for civic leadership in society. Third, especially in a State such as Florida, where a "majority-minority" status will be reached before most American regions, there is a special burden to explore the implications of a multi-cultural and multi-racial society. In none of these areas does political science excel at any SUS school.

We recommend that all political science departments in Florida need to be more concerned with general education. In most institutions nationally, political science faculties take general education to be co-equal with major and graduate education. This does not appear to be a strength at the Florida schools.

In our discussions with faculty in the SUS, there are three other subjects which rarely came up, all of concern to us because of their infrequency of mention. First is minority education. No school (except for FAMU) equals the percentage of minority students for the State as a whole, and there are not aggressive efforts at the departmental level in some schools to redress this. We were distressed that the subject of minority education in a multi-cultural state did not come up more spontaneously. No department has at its fingertips a coherent program either for minority education or for anchoring political science as a keystone of general education requirements. The unifying theme of "citizenship" might be helpful to most departments here. What applies to minority education applies as well to minority faculty. Institutions have made some real strides with respect to women faculty, but none have made significant efforts with respect to minority faculty (except, of course, FAMU).

The second area which rarely came up was honors education. Here we may stray a bit beyond our domain, but we did not find that honors education centrally involved political science. Some of us suspected that this was because honors education did not centrally involve anyone. Political science departments, and perhaps other elements of the universities, have not sufficiently involved themselves in honors education.

A third area which relatively infrequently came up was teacher education. We doubt that most political science faculty know what major changes are afoot nationally in teacher education, and that lack of knowledge is a loss to both political science and the SUS. UCF has had a good program of interaction with high school teachers, but most of the other institutions play little role here. We recommend that each department schedule meetings

with the campus education dean, on a regular basis, to develop plans for additional support by political science of efforts in teacher education.

In a word, political science departments have been rather too insular in the SUS schools. Some of the newer schools have not realized how very rapidly their educational missions are being shifted to a lower-division role. While some have been active in honors education, none seem to have moved faster than their administrations in encouraging honors training. Few indeed have been at the forefront in teacher education from a liberal arts perspective.

We recommend that:

1. Each political science department prepare a report on "Political Science and General Education." This should include attention to cooperative roles in teacher education programs as well. These should be shared with community college constituencies as well as with administrative colleagues. Particular attention should be paid, too, to proposals for increasing minority involvement in political science education.
2. These reports become a subject of regular and continued discussion at regular meetings with the SUS department chairs and should result in a consolidated report for campus administrators, including education deans.
3. Campus administrators should review with each political department current status and proposals for honors education and invite proposals for participation by political science departments, particularly where honors education does not now flourish.

FACULTIES

We are very positively impressed with the calibre of faculties at the SUS institutions. If a random lottery were to occur and faculties were to be reassigned on the basis of the random draw, political science would not be very dramatically different than it is now. This is a strong card for the "regional schools." On the other hand, it is not perhaps as strong a statement about the Ph.D. schools. We see little evidence of "deadwood" among the Florida faculties. We see very dedicated colleagues in general, morale being more a function of individual institutional differences.

One thing which struck us as odd is the differential teaching load at Florida schools. There was every conceivable variation: 2-2, 2-3, 3-3, 4-4, and some variants for individual faculties in between. As far as we can tell, these have no rhyme nor reason. The presence of a graduate mission is no explainer; the quality of a department seems to help little; the amount of research done or asked for seems to help little more. The load at FAMU, as we understand it, is 4-4 and this certainly seems the most unconscionable of all. But none of the others seem to exhibit a very logical pattern. Throughout the SUS there has been little effort to establish differential teaching loads on the basis of faculty research contribution. One rule of thumb might be that a 2-2 load is reasonable for active researchers at the Ph.D. schools and a 2-3 load is reasonable for active researchers at the non-Ph.D. schools. Deans and chairs should talk across the schools about this matter.

On the matter of teaching loads, of course, we recognize, too, that comparability across disciplines within a single school is also important.

We have not investigated variances in sociology, economics, history, psychology, or other comparable disciplines. It is entirely possible that "within school" variance is low but "between school" variance is high. Schools will have to sort this out, for our only benchmark is a comparison across schools.

Faculty morale, it seems to us, is a problem at four schools. The morale at UF is not high. This is an understandable result of years of self- or administratively-imposed neglect. Morale is a grave problem at USF. The problems at USF may be part of a package. It seems to us to be a place where the institution is fundamentally fragmented, with the political science department following in the wake. The morale problems at this institution are not really solvable absent some more general attention at the College and University level. Morale problems at FSU, though, surprise us. Here the department's research future is secure. Here is a department with rightful pretensions to national eminence. And yet the department sees itself as being in conflict with a university administration. This is a sad state of affairs, one which some serious discussions could probably resolve. The fourth morale problem, of course, is at FAU. This was the only school in which we heard regular grumblings about salaries. (FSU has some grumblings about salaries, too, but it was focused on the fact that poor salaries had been associated with the loss of key faculty members.)

On the matter of faculties, we recommend that:

1. Deans and chairs undertake a review of teaching loads in political science across the schools, developing a common understanding of research/teaching expectations at least at comparable institutions.
2. More attention should be given to differential teaching loads at each school, with lower loads for the most active faculty in research.

3. Morale problems at UF, USF, FSU and FAU should be discussed by faculty, chairs, and administrators.

FACILITIES AND SUPPORT SERVICES

In general, the view of facilities which we have is "not bad." The UF situation is, of course, difficult because of the bifurcated location of the department; we feel that this can surely be solved with in a university of this size. At the regional schools the quality of facilities is, by outsiders' standards, nothing short of magnificent. Within an individual unit, though, and we suspect that this is typical of fast-growing schools, they are often cramped.

The FAMU unit seems to be particularly cramped. In part this is because FAMU is an older campus, but facilities for political science at that institution seem worse than many others.

The libraries at the SUS schools seem well-integrated and suitable to the purposes of the institutions. Certainly, no slackening of library investments should be contemplated, but we gained the feeling from many faculty members that libraries were attentive to faculty and student needs. Only at FIU and USF did we hear complaints about the library. Whether this is because of general shortfalls or miscommunications about the library, we cannot say. Our casual impression, too, is that the FAMU library is not commensurate with the school's quality.

Computer facilities vary from school to school, but they are in the ball park with most other American universities. At Central Florida there is a concern that the department is being charged "real time" for computer work and this should be either explained or attended to. Other than that, we found no major complaints about computer facilities. Clearly, all schools could do a better job, with additional resources, in the computing field.

Very probably, all of the departments could benefit from upgraded facilities. We have no reason to believe, however, that situations in political science are noticeably different than in other disciplines. Space, while in general of high quality, seems to be at a premium. This may well be a common problem at fast-growing institutions.

All departments, though, could benefit from greater support in equipment, travel, supplies, and the like. Again, it is difficult for us to report on whether this is a more or less serious situation in political science than other units at the several universities. We would recommend only that the departments and the administrations satisfy themselves that political science is treated similarly to other units and that clear choices are made within the universities about the importance of budget choices among faculty lines, graduate support, travel, and the like. In some departments, the total allocation to faculty travel and general support is only $100 per year. This is small; and yet administrations may well be making decisions that these amounts will remain small in order to accomplish other university missions, such as hiring more faculty. We do not always see the clearest of communications among faculties and administrations about the relative role of support services versus other key matters within the universities.

With respect to facilities and support, on balance we recommend that:

1. Administrations and faculties communicate more clearly about priorities within the universities related to support and facilities. There may be priorities within the universities which the faculty would be willing to place lower than additional support for faculty activities, in which case, these should be communicated to the administration.

2. Space is likely to be a continuing problem within all nine schools and efforts should be made to redress the problem, realizing that this may be a problem for other units, too. All of the nine departments are crowded and facilities planning should be continually discussed with departmental and university administrators.
3. UCF administrators should take care to review with the faculty their computer concerns.
4. FIU and USF administrators should take care to review with faculty their library concerns.

THE SPECIAL PROBLEM OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The relationship between political science and public administration is everywhere problematic. There are few good guidelines to suggest a norm or a model for the relationships between the two programs. FSU separated the two programs some years ago; at UF and other schools the programs seem to coexist reasonably well in a single department.

Tensions often develop between public administration and political science departments. Public administration faculties often put service on a par with publishing. Political science faculties are likely to look down upon people whose first commitment is not to publishing. Students may want to be "applied and employable." Faculties may want students to "get the basics."

All these differences of opinion may lead to internal tensions between political science and public administration faculties. Nationally, in

larger schools, the tendency is to separate political science and public administration programs. This is, however, unwise in schools as small as some SUS schools, where a separate department of public administration would not be administratively viable, and would perhaps leave political science too small, too.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

There follows a summary of general recommendations to the SUS:

1. Chairs of political science departments should establish regular quarterly meetings in which they can discuss issues of mutual concern. These should rotate among the campuses.
2. Additional investments in graduate programs at the strongest schools should be considered. A reasonable investment schedule at FSU could make it into a "top ten" department, perhaps a "top five" department.
3. Elsewhere, graduate programs at the SUS schools need serious attention. Specifically,
   a. Officials at UF should seriously reevaluate the graduate program there, which is not as strong as it should be.
   b. Departments and administrators at all other schools (except FIU which has no graduate programs) should undertake major areas assessments of M.A. programs. These are outlined above. By the time of the next SUS review, these programs should either be viable or be discontinued.

c. Departments should not proliferate graduate programs to off-campus locations, which dissipate energies, in contradictions to the philosophy of the SUS.

d. The "political campaigns" or "applied politics" options should be continued and coordinated at UF and FSU, but should be discontinued in their present form at UWF.

e. The MASS program at FAMU should not expect to have continued political science participation unless resources can be made available either to the program or the department to support it. In this we echo the concerns of the Social Science reviewers. While we may not agree with them fully, we do think that these concerns are matters which need attention from both campus faculties and central SUS offices.

4. The SUS should not develop an additional Ph.D. program. Should an additional program be deemed necessary in the next decade, it should be located at FIU, or should possibly be a joint program between FIU and FAU.

5. At the undergraduate level, programs should, at the local institutions, be continued in their present forms, where there is a great deal of satisfaction with current programs, curricula and faculty attention. More attention will need to be given to additional programming in the areas of political economy, public policy, and international studies. At the same time,

a. Departmental faculties should be asked to prepare documents related to "Political Science and General Education" at their respective institutions. These should be presented to deans

and administration and to appropriate faculty committees. These should also be shared with appropriate community college constituencies.

b. All political science departments in the SUS should be asked to strengthen their relations with teacher education programs. At the minimum, this should involve close cooperation with teachers associations and university schools of education. This should be a component as well of the report on political science and general education.

c. All political science departments should do more with respect to honors education.

d. All political science departments should do more to retain and recruit minority students as well as faculty.

REPORTS ON INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University is a very strong school. Reviewers were impressed with the dedication of its faculty and the students there. Its reputation as the historically strongest black public university is well-deserved. We also found that its faculty is small, dedicated, and confronted by an almost incredible burden of providing graduate and undergraduate instruction. We find the faculty here overworked and not capable of providing the kind of education traditionally associated with an institution of this quality. We are recommending in other parts of this report that the MASS degree be supported adequately and that if resources not be provided to this program, that political science participation in it be discontinued. Promises of more money will not be sufficient here. Also of concern at FAMU is that its teaching loads are high, compared to other institutions in SUS.

The political science program of FAMU is one of three programs that constitute the Department of History, Political Science and Economics which is one of eleven departments within the School of Arts and Sciences. The program offers three degrees--the Bachelor of Science in Political Science, the Bachelor of Arts in Political Science, the Bachelor of Science in Political Science with certification. We wonder if three degrees are not too many for a faculty of this size.

The offering of political science courses began in 1957 under a departmental arrangement and continued as a separate department until 1982. In 1982 the Political Science Department was placed in a Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences. This arrangement was replaced in 1985 by the present arrangement.

Curriculum. The scope of the curriculum offered by the political science program includes the essential content to provide for the student a well rounded exposure to the institutions of government and the varied characteristics of the American political system. Among the courses offered are American Government, Political Philosophy, State and Local Government, The Presidency, Legislatures and Legislation, International Relations, Problems in Urban and Metropolitan Government, Comparative Politics, Civil Liberties and individual directed study.

Due to the demand by students enrolled in the political science program, the faculty also offers a number of courses in public administration/management as well as internships in local and state agencies. In addition to serving the 180-190 student majors in political science, the program also services students from other departments and programs that require students of those programs to take courses offered by the political science faculty, especially American Government. Approximately 1,200 students are served annually by the political science faculty.

Considering the scope and variety of offerings in the political science program and the total numbers served by the programs, the central issue is not the adequacy of the content of the curriculum, but rather the work load placed on the faculty to meet the demands that flow from student majors in political science and others from programs of other schools and departments.

It should be noted that the political science program at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University has a long history and an equally impressive record of quality performance. It is evident, however, that the succession of realignments and reorganizations in the college of Arts and Sciences and within the university has had a negative impact on the political science program in the area of staffing for faculty, while the curriculum has remained at a level of adequacy in scope and content.

Faculty. The faculty of the political science program consists of five persons. One member has not taught a course in the department within the past two years. He now holds the position of Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs. Another faculty member serves as the Director of the Institute for Local Government on a half-time basis, leaving the other half of his time for instruction. This leaves only three full time faculty and a half-time faculty to offer the courses for those students majoring in political science (180-190) and for all other students who are required to take courses in the department plus those who elect courses in political science.

Each of the faculty members hold terminal degrees. The consultants were impressed by the level of knowledge of the faculty in the field of political science and by their dedication to good instruction. In spite of instructional demands, the faculty manages to engage in some research activities and they also attend professional meetings and serve on departmental and university committees. To state that the faculty is overworked is an understatement; indeed they are saturated, if not inundated, by their work loads.

Concerns. The heavy instructional loads of the faculty raises serious issues over student-faculty ratio (50-1), the number of preparations that faculty members must make, the inability of faculty to set aside quality time for student advisement, and the timely scheduling of courses required for the upper level majors.

In order that the issues of concern stated above may be addressed and solutions arrived at there should be at least 4-5 additional faculty members employed to augment the three and one-half faculty now charged with the instructional and coordination functions in the program.

Students. The demand for political science courses is best indicated by the 1200 students that are enrolled in the various courses offered by the program. Students are admitted to the program from community colleges, directly from high schools and as transfers from other colleges. Additionally, students from other programs within the university enroll in courses that are required in their particular majors. Students from the Master of Applied Social Sciences Program also take courses offered by the political science faculty.

Those students interviewed by the consultants expressed great satisfaction with the courses and faculty. However, while the students were high in their praise for the faculty's performance in the classroom and their willingness to provide advisement and counseling, the students expressed concern over the time faculty could spend in advisement and the timely scheduling of courses that are required for completion of requirements for graduation.

Support System. The library collection in political science, public administration/public affairs appears to be limited. There is a clear shortage of electronic data processing equipment for students and faculty.

The political science program share the services of a staff assistant and a clerical person who serve the Chairman and three programs of the department. One questions the adequacy of support personnel for a program that enrolls 180-190 majors and that offers instruction to a total of 1,200 students. Considering the volume of internal and external correspondence and the requirements for typing other materials for faculty, suggest a minimum level of support to the program. In fact it appears strained if not inadequate.

Space. The building in which the political science program is housed is attractive and well maintained. The space allocated to political science is crowded and cramped. Classroom space based on size of the rooms poses a serious problem for scheduling the large classes, especially the lower level classes and classes that are required for students for other programs.

Program Management. The consultant were impressed by the esprit de corp amongst the faculty members and the department chairman. The chairman, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences and Vice President for Academic Affairs recognize the heavy handicap under which the faculty of the political science program is required to work. Each in his position desires to improve the situation. They recognize and understand all facets of the problems and the impact on students and staff. They are aware that only increased resources or reduced expectations can alleviate the problem.

Florida State University

Overview. FSU's political science department is one of the nation's better departments. Additional investments could make it into a very fine department indeed. Insofar as we have a right to make recommendations to SUS, we would recommend that a major program be established to invest significantly in political science at FSU. The institution's strengths could be the department's strengths. We are concerned, though, that this department has dissipated some energies into conflict with the central administration.

Florida State University and the State University System can take great pride in the Department of Political Science at Tallahassee. It is a nationally visible department and it is surely the best in the state of Florida, considering both public and private institutions. It has had a problem, though, retaining its faculty.

The Problem of Holding an Undergraduate Outstanding Faculty. The department needs help from above simply in order to maintain its strong position. Because the things that have made FSU's political science department good are the same things that make its faculty attractive to other ambitious institutions, special attention must be paid to retention of the strongest faculty. FSU has been vulnerable to raids for years. The people lost in this way have distinguished many other departments. Since 1960, Florida State has lost Marian Irish and Ira Sharkansky. Since 1975 the department has lost Paul Beck, Robert Erickson, Norman Luttbeg, Byron Schaefer, Brian Silver, James Stimson and William Thompson, among others. If a healthy fraction of these people had stayed, the department would be even more impressive.

Graduate Program. We were impressed with the professionalism of the graduate students with whom we met. But here too, it appeared that FSU was getting a great deal out of very limited resources. The graduate stipends are not very high at all. The department needs to pay more in order to attract top quality students. Prospective graduate students are often very poorly informed about the quality of individual departments in the universities to which they apply. They are influenced most by institutional prestige, and by the size of stipends. FSU's position is not bad with respect to prestige, but it is disadvantaged with respect to stipends. More attractive fellowships will enable it to compete better with universities that have even more prestige.

Tensions. The department has a well justified sense of pride in its professionalism, productivity and national recognition. Yet it feels that it is not fully appreciated by the FSU administration. As represented by the executive committee and other faculty, this department feels that the administration does not fully respect its commitment to "basic" research, and that the administration would prefer for it to be more active in "applied" research and in service to the public.

The department need not look too far to find an example of a unit that seems to thrive on avoiding consideration of a dichotomy or conflict between pure and applied research, or between research and service. The Policy Sciences Program is a unit in the College of Social Sciences that is staffed in part by political scientists. This program is committed to basic research, but is also active in applied research and service. We consider the estrangement of this program from the political science department to be a serious problem.

A first priority for attention should be to reintegrate the Policy Sciences Program into the political science department. While the program is by definition interdisciplinary and should be thought of as part of the political science department any more than it is part of economics, it constitutes a significant opportunity that is being missed by the department. The most distinguished faculty member in political science is isolated in the program and away from the department. Existing resources are wasted by this artificial division. Complementary skills are being kept apart, and everyone loses.

A comparable effort by the department to reach out to the gerontology and demography programs might also be feasible and interesting to some of those members of the department more interested in mass behavior and less in public policy. Like the department's existing commitments in international affairs and in applied American politics, such efforts might help the department to rise above a false dichotomy between basic and applied research.

The department should also pay more attention to political theory. The department has a narrowness that goes beyond the appropriate consequences of its choices (whether de facto or planned) to emphasize certain strengths such as survey research. Well trained political scientists of any specialization should know something about the great tradition of political philosophy, especially such works as Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau.

The department needs to formalize and write down its procedures for deciding which graduate students are funded and make this document public. This description should go beyond what is currently stated in the document "The Graduate Curriculum", last revised 8/87.

In general, if the state wishes to build on strength in order to achieve excellence, FSU's political science department offers a fine achievement and a fine opportunity. Many states, including those with more resources, lack a public university with a department that is as good and as professionally committed as this one.

Florida Atlantic University

Once one of the nation's premier young political science departments, the department at FAU has been living in the shadow of a "Golden Age." It has yet to reachieve the aspirations of the department then, partly through some unfortunate decisions of its own. At the same time, with clear internal leadership, it can achieve much again. It struggles in the interim with its graduate program, which is not altogether atypical of Florida schools. Its undergraduate program remains strong, though.

Undergraduate and Graduate Programs. Opened in 1964 as an upper division and graduate level university, Florida Atlantic University enrolled its first freshman class in 1984. Most of the university's 10-11,000 students continue to enter the university as transfers from community colleges and other institutions in Florida. A large portion of them come from the state's southeastern region. In addition to the campus at Boca Raton, the university offers courses at three locations in Broward County.

The Department of Political Science, which currently enrolls 150-160 majors, offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in political science and a Bachelor of Public Affairs, which is designed for students especially interested in public policy analysis and public administration. Initially,

the department's undergraduate curriculum was highly innovative, comprising a few broadly-cast courses focused on major subfields in the discipline. In recent years the department has moved in the direction of a more standard curriculum. Still, narrowly specialized courses are avoided and the curriculum is lean in content. The courses listed in the catalog are regularly offered. Class enrollments, particularly on the Boca Raton campus, are strong. Substantial numbers of the students enrolled in political science classes (15-30 percent) are non-majors, although the university and college have no specific political science requirements.

The Department is doing excellent work in undergraduate education, which is its primary mission. Students are required to distribute their courses widely among the different subfields and to take two research-oriented courses. The undergraduates that we spoke with were quite satisfied both with the range of courses offered and with the quality of instruction. The faculty in turn indicate a strong concern for and interest in undergraduate teaching.

The Department of Political Science also offers the Masters of Arts degree in political science. This program currently enrolls two full time and ten part time students. This was a very productive program in the 1970s, when 27 students were awarded master's degrees. Only two degrees have been conferred in the 1980s.

Faculty. The faculty of the Department consists regularly of seven members, one of whom devotes half of his time to the Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems. Two other persons who hold professorial rank in the department devote almost all of their time to university administrative duties.

Overall, the department's research productivity, while commendable, is not as strong as it was in the 1970s. According to one study made during that period, based on publications in standard political science journals and measured on a per capita basis, the department was one of the most productive in the nation. Since then, the department has lost some of its zest and stature. Several very productive faculty members, after developing strong professional reputations at FAU, were lured away by universities with larger departments, doctoral programs, and higher salaries. Obviously, this has been a bit disconcerting to those who have remained. The department has continued generally to recruit good quality faculty when vacancies have occurred. Still, things are just not what once they were.

Research Support. Departmental teaching loads, which are two courses per semester, are highly favorable for research productivity. Computer facilities are good (for both research and instructional purposes). The university library, while not a "research" library, has good basic collections of materials useful for political science research.

The Future. Mention has been made concerning a doctoral program in political science at FAU. In time, given the burgeoning population in southeast Florida, the continuing expansion of the university, and the desirability of locating educational programs more proximately to their clientele, a case can be made for a doctoral program, especially if it is focused on the needs of the area and its shaped by the goals of the university. In the next few years, however, attention should be focused on continuing the strong undergraduate program, strengthening the master's program, and expanding and strengthening ties with other university units, notably the Joint Center.

Rather, it seems advisable that the department develop a programmatic focus for itself, especially at the graduate level. (This programmatic focus would be a matter of emphasis, of distinctiveness, and not of exclusive concern). Given the university's urban environment, the existence of the Joint Center, and the directions of the university's future development (as indicated by university administrators), a focus drawing on urbanism, growth management, and social policy could be appropriate. Students in the program would take courses in other areas for perspective and balance, and some might concentrate their efforts outside the focus. It is inefficient for a department of this size to hold itself out as able equally to offer graduate work in most subfields of the discipline.

Here are our specific recommendations:

1. The department should develop a distinctive focus for its graduate program.
2. An additional faculty member should be added whose specialization will fit the focus selected.
3. The two-course teaching load for political science faculty should be retained, with the expectation that research productivity will continue.
4. The university should increase the financial assistance available for outstanding graduate students.
5. The department should strive harder to secure outside funding for research and develop a more extensive research relationship with the Joint Center.
6. The department should seek to eliminate its need to use adjunct professors.

7. The department and university administration should work closely to develop a salary scale with adequate differences between ranks.

University of West Florida

This program has a strong faculty and a clear commitment to quality undergraduate education. There are some problems in the current M.A. program, identified elsewhere in this report, but it a good department intent upon providing quality education to its undergraduate and graduate students. Many of the problems of the current M.A. program can be dealt with without a wholesale reassessment of the department.

The Department offers a general undergraduate degree in Political Science. Specialized undergraduate majors in legal administration and criminal justice, as well as one in International Studies, are also coordinated by the department. At the graduate level, the largest program is the MPA degree. Associated with this is a special interdisciplinary program in Coastal Zone Studies. The M.A. in Political Science has recently been restructured to become one in Applied Politics (campaign management) -- one of three such emphases in S.U.S. The Department also administers two institutes. The Center for State and Local Government provides various services to state and local government bodies and coordinates student training and internship activities. The Rayburn-Dirksen Institute of Applied Politics houses the Department's growing activities in this area (e.g., a new Florida State poll that is just starting up). Finally, the University has just introduced a requirement that all lower division stu-

dents must take the Department's basic American Political Institutions course.

In addition to these general missions of UWF, however, the Political Science Department has engaged in several highly commendable efforts to develop innovative programs appealing to much broader state and even national clienteles. One is the Coastal Zone Studies program (which includes biology and geography courses) which was selected for quality improvement support by the University. Another is the Department's recent development of an "Applied Politics" concentration as reflected by the restructuring of the M.A. program in Political Science and by the activities of the Rayburn-Dirksen Institute.

Departmental Strengths and Weaknesses. The department appears to be one of the better ones at West Florida. It is perhaps the premier teaching Department at UWF. Its faculty have won a highly disproportionate number of University teaching awards; and interviews with students and alumni in the Political Science, Legal Administration, MPA, and Applied Politics programs produced rave reviews of the teaching faculty, department chair, and administrative staff.

Given the fairly heavy teaching load of three courses per semester, the faculty's research record seems good as well. While not outstanding by national standards of research-oriented universities, political scientists are considered to publish at well above the average university rate by UWF administrators; and one department member won the University's research award. The faculty are also involved in very substantial service activities.

The major weakness or vulnerability of the department stems precisely from these strengths, however. This is that the Department appears stretched too thinly over a wide variety of programs. There are two essential problems here. First, aggregate staffing for all these program responsibilities is adequate at best.

Second, these competing claims for resources have undoubtedly contributed to the significant strains that evidently exist within the Department. This conflict represents a concatenation of institutional rivalry, personal animosity, and disagreement over management style, but it certainly is counterproductive at a time of change when the Department needs to make basic strategic decisions.

Curriculum Evaluation. Within the limits imposed by a medium-sized faculty, the Political Science curriculum appears quite good. The Department seems destined to assume an important role in general education at West Florida with its basic American government course. There is also the potential for it to develop other nontechnical courses of interest to lower division non-majors. The Department may also play a key role in the creation of a University Honors Program -- which seems long overdue. Second, the Department has also been quite active in participating in interdisciplinary programs -- most notably the Coastal Zone Studies program with Biology and Geography, the Legal Administration program with History, and the International Studies program with a variety of Social Science programs.

Faculty Evaluation. By all measures, the Political Science Department has an excellent teaching faculty and has rendered considerable service to the University.

Applied Politics Focus. The Department has a major focus upon "applied politics." At the abstract level, this appears an appropriate strategy. Given the regional market served by West Florida, applied aspects of political science might be expected to the most in line with student demand; and the Rayburn-Dirksen Institute and the associated graduate program in campaign management represent the Department's only feasible opportunity for attaining national visibility and respect.

However, in practice, the Department has defined "applied politics" extremely narrowly as political campaigning. This not only excludes the other important applied programs that already exist but also ignores such central fields as public policy analysis and ethical issues in the practice of politics and public administration. Moreover, it begs the responsibility of a university to expose students to broader perspectives and questions, in particular other political cultures both within the United States and beyond our national borders.

These strengths and weaknesses are most clearly reflected in the M.A. program in campaign management. On the one hand, the program has already proved successful and made a valuable contribution to the Department and the University.

On the other hand, however, the program has some significant weaknesses which must be addressed immediately. The more successful it becomes, the greater the danger that it will detract from the mainstream political science program. The program also appears to be too much of a one-man show.

Second, a campaign-oriented program creates some risk for the Department and University. Political campaigning is a controversial and at times shady endeavor. This problem is exacerbated by the evident lack of

philosophical underpinnings for the program. It is frankly shocking to find students who defend political dirty tricks, whose vocabulary so often includes the word "ruthless," and who seem so little concerned about any value or objective that can be achieved through a democratic process.

Recommendations

A. GENERAL MISSION

1. The University should encourage the Department's innovative and aggressive approach to program development and university service.

B. CURRICULUM

1. The Department should meet the demands for large-scale American government courses through a class format that combines senior professors and a large number of teaching assistants. This should both permit the continuation of educational quality and enhance the Department's graduate program.
2. The Department should develop several general education courses for non-majors on such topics as international issues which could both promote civic education and recruit political science majors.

C. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

1. The Department should provide release time to its faculty members who are engaged in productive research programs, although safeguards should be adopted to keep this from being abused.
2. The Department should purchase several personal computers for general use by faculty and students.

D. STAFFING RESOURCES

1. At least one of the two positions that the Department seems likely to obtain in the next few years should be in a non-American area. Both positions should be strongly grounded in either normative or empirical political theory.

2. If current negotiations for a graduate program for the Naval Base prove successful, the Department should try to obtain the resources to support a fulltime faculty member, rather than staffing the program through overload teaching.

3. The Department should significantly increase its affirmative action efforts in the recruitment of both faculty and students.

E. DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION

1. The University is fortunate to possess such an energetic and innovative Chair for its Political Science program.

2. While the Department is something of a holding company of disparate programs, this organization appears reasonable for a University of West Florida's size. In particular, it does not make financial nor organizational sense to split the Department.

3. The external evaluators were not given enough information to make a substantive assessment of the internal disputes within the Department. These conflicts do not appear atypical of other political science programs or of other Departments at West Florida. Any involvement of the UWF administration in them should focus on the institutional, not the personal, dimensions.

F. APPLIED POLITICS FOCUS

1. Given the estrangement of most of the faculty from the program, the overly narrow focus of the current program, and the similar programs that exist at the university of Florida and Florida State University, the M.A. program in Applied Politics should be radically restructured or discontinued.

University of North Florida

The program at the University of North Florida exists in a department which appears to be administratively chaotic. And yet, its faculty seems to have clear conceptions of its mission, a remarkable consensus on intellectual issues which drive the mutual curiosity of the department, and a very clear sense of its role in general education. No doubt the central administration and the department could share a better conception of the mission of the department there. Here, though, is a vital and active group of scholars and teachers. Clearly, it should grow more in the direction of public policy and political economy.

Overview. Political science is an undergraduate degree program in a combined Department of Political Science and Sociology. It numbers seven faculty members, three of whom are shared with the Masters Program in Public Administration, one of whom is acting Dean of Arts and Sciences, and one of whom heads the Center for Local Government Administration. In general, the faculty are well-trained, with Ph.D.s from major institutions, committed to their academic roles and to their institutions, competent in the exercise of their varied activities, and extremely hard-working. The program enjoys a good reputation among students for the quality of its instruction, has a

surprisingly good record of extramural research funding (primarily because of the activities of the Center for Local Government Administration) and fellowship awards, is well published, and enjoys a collegial and participatory work environment. The teaching, service, and (increasingly) research demands on the faculty are considerable (as is the case for all of the faculty at the UNF). That the program faculty do so well in light of the heavy demands made of them and the meager infrastructural support they receive from the university is testament to their talent and commitment. This positive perception of the department is apparently fairly widely shared in the university as demonstrated by the following observations from last year's Program Review Committee: "This is one of the strongest academic programs in the university, with a faculty whose scholarly reputation has placed it on the map...It is, indeed, a hardworking faculty...it is also hard-pressed."

. The Faculty. The academic quality of program faculty is, relatively speaking, rather high. All have the Ph.D. and most have been trained in nationally recognized political science departments.

Because of its location in a combined department which also includes sociology, criminal justice, anthropology, social welfare, and the master's level public administration program, the faculty is involved in a wide-range of interdisciplinary research, teaching, and service efforts. This interdisciplinary perspective is further encouraged by the interest of two members of the program in the field of political economy (which is by its nature broadly interdisciplinary), the training in both political science and public administration of several others, and by the presence of the Center for Local Government Administration. The interdisciplinary

perspective, while much talked about in academic circles, is rarely encountered in the real world of the university, and because of its very rich potential in both teaching and research, should be encouraged and nurtured in the program's current activities and in future recruitments. The program also shows a healthy mix of applied and more theoretical approaches in its activities, and this mix should also continue to be encouraged.

There are, to be sure, several problems which need to be addressed by both faculty in the program and by the higher administration of the university. First, while concentration and interaction on the scholarly front is entirely salutary, it also means, given a faculty so few in number, that several important gaps will inevitable appear in the curriculum . Second, the two members of the faculty who have not published to expected levels must be encouraged to increase their research productivity. Third, and perhaps most importantly, it is likely that the institution will soon face the prospect of losing its most productive and visible members from the program to other institutions that provide better support for the teaching, service, and research activities of its faculty.

Curriculum. The courses seem generally to be of high quality in terms of organization, reading materials, clarity of expectations, and standards. The quality of curricular offerings is considerably enriched by the interdisciplinary training and collaboration of the political science faculty.

The Self-Study suggests that an introductory course in American government be required of all UNF students under the General Education requirements of the university. Since one of the functions of any institution of higher education must be the nourishment of an interested, knowledgeable,

and public spirited citizenry, this suggestion in the Self-Study seems entirely reasonable. Given the interdependent nature of the world economic and political systems, an argument could also be made for the inclusion of an international relations courses in General Education.

The faculty must respond to strongly expressed discontent about the course in social science methodology required of all majors in the Department of Political Science and Sociology. To be sure, methodology courses are almost always resisted by students. Nevertheless, their complaints about lack of consistency in course content year to year, and the general absence of "hands on" practicums seem justified. This might be combined with curricular initiatives in the area of computer applications in political science where no such course is presently offered.

Students. Interviews with students suggest great enthusiasm on their part about the Political Science program. They praise in particular the quality of teaching, small class sizes which encourage participation on the part of students, and the accessibility of faculty. It is of interest to note that they felt the same way about the institution in general, a finding that is a tribute to this university. Student interest in the Political Science program is shown in the steady rise in the number of head-count majors (from 48 in Fall 1983 to 74 in Fall 1987) and lower division "intended" majors and in the number of students in political science classes.

The most persistent complaint voiced by the students concerns advising. This is, to be sure, a persistent complaint by students around the country, but their complaints seem to be very well founded in this case.

The infrastructural and faculty development resources available to political science and other UNF faculty are so meager and inadequate as to call into question faculty ability to meet individual, program, and university goals in teaching, service, and research. One result is persistent danger that the most visible faculty will depart to more supportive environments. There are, to be sure, more than a few bright spots. Faculty report the campus and community to be extremely attractive and comfortable. Most report satisfaction with the quality of the collection, journal availability, and services of the library. Most report satisfaction with the physical facilities for academic activities. Space is plentiful and aesthetically pleasing. With these exceptions, infrastructural support is seriously deficient. Operating expense budgets are so small that faculty are compelled to pay for xeroxing classroom materials out of their own pockets. Microcomputers, essential in the modern university for all aspects of research, teaching, and service, have not been provided by the institution but have been paid for by faculty members themselves.

Here follows specific recommendations for UNF:

1. The university should attempt to enhance the level of support for sabbaticals, materials, professional travel, and microcomputers.
2. The university should think carefully about the possible negative implications of additional "outreach" educational programs.
3. The university should attempt to enhance the quality and visibility of the political science program by granting permission in the near future to hire a senior scholar. This position should be used to either strengthen present fields (such as in organization/social theory or

public policy) or fill important curricular gaps in international affairs and comparative politics.

4. Given the number of available faculty and the enormous burdens on them, the program should be discouraged from instituting a joint graduate program with history and philosophy.
5. The university should consider American government and international relations as required courses in the General Education Program.
6. The faculty exchange program with the south Bank Polytechnic in London should be encouraged and supported.
7. Some program specific advising services should be provided by political science.
8. The administration should attempt to conduct the institutional level Program Review and the BOR review at the same time in order to eliminate time-consuming redundancies.

Florida International University.

Here is a real strength of the SUS. Little faculty deadwood is apparent; virtually every faculty member is an active, publishing scholar. The department has wisely resisted blandishments to disperse its intellectual resources to M.A. level graduate education in political science. While there is some concern about being spread too thin among the various campuses, it is clear that the department thinks of itself a "Swarthmore model" of high-calibre undergraduate education. Students appear to agree. We urge in the strongest possible terms continued, positive attention from the

administration at FIU. To us at least, it seems a key part of an almost electric environment at FIU.

Overall Assessment. Judged in terms of the criteria of teaching, research and service to the University, our view of the department of political science at Florida International University is quite positive.

From the point of view of its mission to develop and deliver a quality program of undergraduate education the department's performance has been excellent. There is little question that all the members of the department are skilled and dedicated teachers who individually and collectively give a very high priority to undergraduate teaching. The program which is offered is well balanced and provides a solid core of instruction in the main fields of contemporary political science. In addition, the department maintains high but realistic standards for undergraduate performance and in so doing helps transmit a very positive set of academic values to its students.

This perception of the department is widely shared throughout the University community. Former and current students spoke of their educational experience in political science in terms of praise and gratitude.

The department's performance in the area of research and publication has been quite good. The department is active and visible professionally through conference participation and publication. The rate and amount of publication is noteworthy, particularly in light of the other demands on faculty time.

It is evident that this is an energetic and productive department with a very positive attitude. Overall the tone and morale of the department is very good. The department maintains a high level of collegiality which contributes most positively to its tone and morale. Indeed, we were struck

by the high quality of the department's internal "culture" and the care and concern that is given to developing and maintaining its academic culture over time. Analysis of past decisions indicates that the department has maintained a high level of quality control in its recruitment and worked to integrate new younger members into the department and its values.

Some Questions and Problems. Under the heading of "spreading the department thin," the single largest problem confronting the department is the North Miami Campus. Under the present policy, the department is committed to offering a major at North Miami in addition to the program at the Tamiami main campus. This has created a tremendous strain on the department that threatens the department in a number of ways, not the least of which is a pressure on morale.

The present staff of two full time faculty (and even a promised additional position) at North Miami is woefully inadequate to deliver any kind of major, let alone one of the quality at Tamiami. The University's plan to hire one more person next year will help, but only marginally. A staff of three can not provide a political science major with any real depth or breadth.

In our view, the existence of five fields is somewhat over ambitious especially given that the major person in judicial politics is also doing teaching and research in comparative politics. The department should consider reducing to four fields by folding judicial politics into American politics. In addition, we suggest the department should consider requiring introductory courses to all four fields--American, Comparative, International Relations and Theory, or possibly maintaining the American requirement with a breadth requirement of introductory courses in two other fields.

Students should then be free to develop their upper division program with appropriate counseling.

Interdisciplinary Nexus. The greater Miami area has become a major entrepot and gateway to Latin America. The University has recognized this and built a nationally recognized program in Latin American and Caribbean studies. The department has contributed significantly to the Latin American program by providing courses and the program's highly successful director. The relationship between the Latin American program and the department has been a healthy one and should be encouraged to flourish further. It makes eminent sense for a department which simply cannot cover all world areas to continue to maintain and build its strength in the Latin American area.

In addition, the department and the University should consider ways of bringing the department into the process of educating secondary school teachers in the area of American government and politics. Specifically, links to the school of education should be explored in which the department would provide courses in American politics for all students training to be secondary school social studies teachers.

Another avenue to explore in this area is the department's relationship with the Institute for Public Policy and Citizenship Studies. Specifically, the department might be encouraged to play a role in designing a multidisciplinary certificate program in public policy and citizenship.

Graduate Program. During the period of evaluation, the issue of graduate programs was raised by administrative officers. These are complex matters which are beyond the purview of this review. However, we did make some observations regarding graduate programs.

As presently constituted, the department of political science is not up to mounting and sustaining a graduate program. Both the local and lead consultant noted that an adequate graduate program in political science would demand a large resource outlay to acquire faculty, provide graduate student stipends and invest in infrastructure such as library. Failure to invest such resources would result in the creation of an at best mediocre program that would be a burden on the department.

The reviewers also raised serious questions regarding possible multi-disciplinary graduate programs such as a social science graduate degree. It was noted that there is no market for graduates of such a program, particularly in the academic world. We doubt the emergence of such a market in the next decade.

University of Florida

Overview. The University of Florida has a small faculty. Of 700 faculty members of CAS, only 22 are members of the political science department. (By way of contrast, at the University of Kansas, 34 of 500 arts and sciences faculty members are associated with political science and public administration.) This ratio would be about 50 percent of the normal share of political science/college faculty nationally. There are many reasons why political science at UF is so small. The Dean and the department may not have agreed on a mode of development. Certainly, the department has done too little to help itself. Your reviewers found shocking stories that undergraduate students found it easier to get into "gateway" courses as seniors than as freshmen because seniors got first crack at enrollment.

This is part of a pattern at UF, and the pattern is not such as to make your consultants comfortable with the state of graduate or undergraduate educa0 tion at UF.

We were concerned, too, that one administrator reported that UF might "cede leadership" in political science to FSU. We doubt that such an attitude prevails at Texas A&M, UCLA or Michigan State. Here our disciplinary parochialism may show, but we note that political science continues to rank among most major universities, public and private, as one of the three to five major disciplines in undergraduate attention. Something is awry either with our conception or with the conception of UF.

It is important to note that we do not lay all the blame for this unfortunate state of affairs with the administration at UF. The department there has not been imaginative in catching winds of the most important disciplinary trends. With new leadership, and possible new appointments, it may be possible for ground to be regained. Some serious discussions, though, will have to take place at all levels of the University about this state of affairs. The administration may well have chosen to "write off" political science. It may have had its reasons, but it is now time, we think, to reason together.

One strength of the operation, of course, is the number of multidisciplinary centers in comparative and international studies in which the department participates. Especially noteworthy are the programs in African and Latin American studies. Another strength, is the M.A. program in public administration. Graduates of the program have been well-placed throughout the state. It has a commendable record of recruiting and graduating

minority students. A similar relationship may well develop in the political campaigning emphasis.

The consultants commend both the department and the University for identifying a number of problems which concern us. While the University and the consultants may disagree about the relative standing of graduate programs in the SUS, there can be no doubt that there is room for improvement in the situation at UF and that attention is being given at all levels of the University to these problems.

Any assessment of the Political Science Department, University of Florida (Gainesville) must begin from one central fact: The department's mission entails not only fostering a distinguished research-oriented, graduate student-training faculty but also providing a solid undergraduate education to more than 700 political science majors as well as serving other student and campus programs. These multiple responsibilities impose a tremendous burden on a relatively small (22 FTE at present) faculty that must on occasion work under circumstances that limit its capacity to meet its obligations effectively. Seen from this perspective, the department has problems and promise.

The Undergraduate Curriculum. In the Fall of 1987, the department approved a new undergraduate curriculum. Students must take 30 hours of political science, including three introductory courses in the three major subfields in the discipline (American politics, comparative politics, and international relations) and a course in statistics (which may help students fulfill the College mathematics requirement).

The problems in attaining the full potential of such a program flow directly from an imbalance between student demands and faculty resources.

It is rare to hear complaints that a department has too many students, but this theme recurred regularly in discussions with the faculty. In the Fall semester, 1987, there was only one undergraduate course that was not completely full. Enrollments reflect the size of the classroom; if more spaces were available, more students would be in political science classes. If more faculty were present in undergraduate classes, the courses would be smaller and the learning experiences for students would be richer. As it stands, large classes pressure faculty to use machine gradeable examinations in lieu of essay tests. In consequence, writing skills are neglected and critical thinking inhibited. Enrollment procedures complicated matters further. The introductory courses fill quickly, usually with seniors who have been unable previously to get into them. Underclassmen and women, who need these classes most, cannot gain admission and are frequently forced to take upper level courses for which they are not always well prepared. More space in the beginning courses, to accommodate new students, would begin to alleviate the problem.

Moreover, large numbers of students and relatively few faculty make advising difficult and scarce. Given their other responsibilities--notably research and graduate teaching--and the lack of incentives to advise undergraduates, it is amazing the student-faculty contacts are as extensive as they are.

The Graduate Program. The shortage of faculty also profoundly influences the graduate program in political science. In the past few years, intensive reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of faculty and curriculum led the department to reshape its offerings, to take full advantage of the teaching staff. The department, recognizing the disparate and eclectic

character of political science as a discipline, decided to focus its graduate program on three broad areas: American Political Institutions and Behavior, International and Comparative Studies, and Public Policy and Administration. Such a streamlining makes excellent sense; it identifies those areas in which the department has the resources to offer graduate training--at both the M.A. and Ph.D. levels--of superior quality.

Currently, the graduate program is small. Only six Ph.D.s have been granted since 1982-83. The department could, and should, train some additional doctoral students without taxing its resource excessively. The students in the program are good, with high test scores at the time of admission, and they are well placed in the academic world on completion of their degrees. Some efforts--advertising with a brochure, contacts with former students, informal communication with colleagues at other institutions--to recruit entering Ph.D. students would seem worthwhile. More important, the department lacks the financial resources to support more than a handful of students. Seven or eight Teaching Assistantships are not enough to sustain a sound program.

Finally, the department has embarked on a major venture--an M.A. degree in Political Campaigning coupled with a Florida Institute for Research on Elections (FIRE)--that promises to provide the university with great visibility and distinction. The degree itself meets a growing need--more and more politicians need to harness the techniques of modern campaigning. It is a need that few other academic institutions have as yet recognized, although its relations with a similar program at FSU need clarification. The Florida department is in "on the ground floor" with a well-structured program (offered in collaboration with the College of Journalism) that

should provide high quality training unavailable elsewhere. As the result of a major gift from William R. Hamilton, a leading professional political consultant, FIRE will house a major archive of campaign and polling data spanning some 25 years. These data will provide a major resource for teaching about campaigning and, more important, for faculty research. FIRE and the M.A program in campaigning will, with adequate support from the university, prove to be a major asset and source of distinction to the department.

The Faculty. The quality of the faculty, it goes without saying, determines the quality of the department, and the department has a solid core of competent faculty on board. To repeat a theme that emerges clearly throughout the discussion of curricular matters, however, there are too few faculty to enable the department to meet its various responsibilities.

Prior to the last few years, departmental recruitment focused on hiring beginners at the assistant professor level. While other department on campus seem to have added visible senior scholars to their rosters, political science did not. The decision to hire at the junior level has dimmed the luster of the department, given the passing from the scene of some of its best known senior professors.

In sum, the faculty is good, and when the senior faculty additions have been made it will be stronger. This, in turn, should enable attractive of quality junior faculty to fill the remaining vacancies. The department needs to grow by some eight or nine positions over the next several years, and if it succeeds in hiring scholars of distinction and promise, it should be able to strengthen its undergraduate and graduate courses offerings as well as enhance its standing in the profession.

Support. The faculty seem generally content with the support facilities available to them. For the most part, they praise the library, both for the size and breadth of its collections and for the high quality assistance library staff offers.

There are a few other difficulties that might be addressed. Space is a serious problem. As noted, enrollments are effectively limited by a shortage of classrooms; larger rooms would enable the faculty to serve more students, from outside the department in particular. The departmental faculty is not housed in a single building and their separation at different locations inhibits easy contact and communication and impedes the development of a much needed (in any department) esprit de corps.

Conclusions and Recommendations. The foregoing suggests a number of conclusions:

1. On balance, the department's future is promising. After a period of drift and delay, recently it has mobilized its collective energies to redefine its curricula and reaffirm its commitment to scholarly activities that befit its aspirations to improved status within the discipline. It has now many of the hallmarks of a high quality professional department in place, and it has established productive relationships with other programs and departments on campus and with numerous public and private sector agencies.
2. The major, and quite serious, problem is a shortage of faculty. Without a substantial increase in teaching staff, the department will continue to be stretched thin, required to teach undergraduates in large sections only, and unable to offer sufficient substantive seminars to graduate students. It is imperative that the incoming Dean of

the College honor the commitment of his/her predecessor to permit the department to grow to a minimum of 30 FTE. Such growth will enhance an already strong faculty and allow the research and graduate training missions, central to the department and the statewide university system, to flourish. The university will, of course, need to make available adequate salary and other resources to enable the department to recruit and retain not only the senior faculty now being sought but also the more numerous junior faculty to be hired in the immediate future.

3. The M.A. programs also serve the department very well. They are stronger than most M.A. programs in SUS. They attract good students and train many for service to state and nation. More could be encouraged to pursue the Ph.D. program, which would also benefit from wider efforts to recruit quality students from undergraduate institutions and other sources. Both the M.A. and Ph.D. programs would be stronger if the university provided more funds for fellowships and assistantships.

4. Support facilities for the department are decent, but might be improved at the margins. Additional administrative staff would, in the long run, prove cost-efficient; they could relieve the regular faculty of routine chores, permitting some of the latter to spend more time in the classroom and to devote more energy to their research efforts.

In conclusion, then, the Florida Department of Political Science faces some challenges, but may have a promising future. It has done what it can, especially with respect to modernizing its curricular, with the resources available to it. With additional support, especially for new faculty

positions, there is every reason to believe it can achieve its goal: a "place in the sun" within the political science discipline.

University of Central Florida

UCF in an institution, which while technological, has an abiding commitment to liberal arts education -- one articulated well by the central administration. Political science, with a strong teaching faculty, plays a key role in furthering this administration's goal. The faculty have very heavy teaching loads, and yet research productivity and service activities are strong.

Curriculum. The Department provides a responsible and responsive set of course offerings (1) to meet the general education requirements of the University community, (2) to provide a popular and challenging undergraduate major, (3) to guarantee a solid MA degree program and (4) to cooperate in three ongoing certificate programs.

General Education. Political Science 2041 (American National Government) is required of all undergraduates enrolled at the University of Central Florida. This demand on department resources limits flexibility and constrains other scheduling and course offerings.

The Department also regularly schedules courses that meet requirements for Education majors, and takes seriously the role it now plays and may increasingly play in the academic preparation of public administrators, paralegals and criminal justice personnel.

The primary orientation within the Department is to provide traditional liberal arts education. Course syllabi as well as discussions with faculty

and students reveal a strong commitment to developing critical inquiry, writing and oral communication skills as well as depth and breadth of substantive knowledge through course content. Scarce resources limit the number of Honors courses that can be offered but as vigorous Honors program evolves at UCF, this Department can be expected to play a major role in its development and success.

The Master's program is small and development is hindered by lack of resources to fund a small core of full time graduate students/assistants. Until a numerically critical mass is established, the MA program is likely to struggle.

In summary, the UCF Department of Political Science is a stellar teaching unit. An obvious sense of shared commitment to and responsibility for first-rate education underlies an exemplary teaching record. The program for majors is traditional in structure, well conceived, and well executed. Standards are high and expectations are readily conveyed to and accepted by students.

Students. Student loyalty to the UCF Political Science faculty and program is impressive. Although certainly not a random sample of students, the comments of more than twenty young men and women encountered during the two day review were uniformly positive (both undergraduate and graduate) and conveyed a sense of pride in being part of the unit. Students are particularly appreciative of the access they have to faculty, to the involvement of the faculty in advising and non-classroom activities and the opportunities provided through a variety of program related experiences (Model UN, Law Day, Model OAS, Model Senate, Pre-Law Union, Pi Sigma Alpha). Student perceptions are that standards are high, demands considerable and treatment

fair, and these perceptions are in harmony with the impression gained from reviews of course related materials and discussions of curriculum and teaching philosophies.

The Department is actively involved in Community College articulation efforts and the linkages that have been made are productive and reciprocal.

Faculty. The UCF Department shares a consensual decision-making ethos and is remarkably collegial. It has a collective sense of responsibility and a strong commitment to learning as well as teaching. In terms of structure, leadership and performance, this Department is healthy and should not be prescribed unsolicited remedies for ills that do not exist.

Although faculty interests, backgrounds and personalities are quite diverse, recent recruitment appears to have been thoughtful and realistic.

General. The UCF Department of Political Science has a sense of mission and is moving steadily toward accomplishing their goals -- often in the face of significant obstacles. This positive trajectory can be expected to continue if given appropriate support and encouragement. However, the Department will have to make some hard choices in the near future, choices which will influence the course it will take in the 1990's.

The Department will also have to decide how much it wants to move in tandem with the University's interest in enhancing the interface between the University and the area's business and high tech communities. The Department should position itself to be receptive to opportunities associated with both business and technology interests There are good endeavors now in the politics and technology area. This would be a good focus for the department.

The Political Science Department at the University of Central Florida should be a source of pride for the University and the College. Its academic, professional and disciplinary standards are rigorous, and its respect for the support of the basic values of the academy are obvious. It is well administered and well received by students, alumni and peers. It accomplishes much with very limited resources and fosters a sense of pride and identity among its members and students.

University of South Florida

USF is a complex place to the outsider. The second largest university in SUS, it is certainly the most difficult for the outsider to comprehend. Dispersed over four campuses, with 19 units reporting to the dean of social sciences, it seems a very chaotic place indeed to outsiders. Budgetary lines seem to run this way and that. Political scientists seem to be in several departments. Administrative reporting is chaotic. More than anything else, a sense of fragmentation strikes us in considering USF.

Not surprisingly, given this state of affairs, morale in political science at USF is low. It has every reason to be. While we are short on specific recommendations which do not depend upon general university reassessment, we will provide a number of very specific recommendations and scenarios. We commend these recommendations to the department and the administration. It is important to indicate that these recommendations are endorsed by both the campus consultant and the lead consultant.

Analysis of the Existing Situation. The Department of Political Science at the University of South Florida has a number of positive

features, but also has a number of troubling and persistent problems that tend to obscure the positive features. In fairness to the members of that department, many of its problems are not of its own making but reflect structural problems within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the University as a whole. The Department cannot, however, be absolved of all responsibilities for the problems which will be discussed below. Further, some of these problems could be corrected or at least ameliorated by their own action even if the ultimate solutions to most of them lies outside the Department and, in some instances, outside the College.

Positive Features. The most positive characteristic of the Department is that it is a good and productive undergraduate teaching department. It has a large number of majors, the evidence is that the quality of instruction is very high, and that the students are quite satisfied with the education they are receiving in their political Science program. The Department also does a good deal of service teaching for other programs in the University and generates a substantial number of student credit hours for the College.

A second positive feature is that the Department has attempted to respond to opportunities and perceived demand for programs, especially in the creation of its graduate program for McDill Air Force Base. Although we believe that this program is not really in the best interests of the Department (see below), they must be commended for responding to the incentive structure that was present in the University under the former President and Provost.

Third, the Department has been successful in recruiting some capable junior scholars, at least two of whom would be an outstanding faculty members in almost any department of political science.

Difficulties. Unfortunately, the difficulties which the outsider sees when encountering the Department tend to overshadow the positive features of the Department. There is a very serious need to address these difficulties if there is to be the development of the program to even approach fulfilling the goals which the new President has set for the University.

The most overwhelming image the outsider receives of this Department and indeed of the University is fragmentation. The teaching and research functions that might be housed in a single political science department are now housed in three units -- Political Science, Public Administration, and International Studies.

The Department itself is split geographically, with two members at the campus in St. Petersburg. One of those members refuses to participate in the Department as a whole (with the center in Tampa) and is allowed to remain isolated.

We see the problem and frame it as follows: the chaotic organization and fragmentation of USF is replicated in the Department of Political Science and, of course, the College of Social Sciences. A closck cannot be rewound. The five campus system, for good and ill, is there to stay. The questions, therefore, are these:

1. What will be the future programmatic control of political science and political scienctists? This is more than an idle "reporting authority" question. One reasonable scenario is to ask that all political scientists on the campuses report through the same hierarchy. Surely,

the situation in which the Dean and the Department Chair now find themselves is untenable.

2. Given that fragmentation over five campuses will continue, is it necessary for all or even most of them to offer political science? As our local consultant observes, "while the department itself can do nothing about the underlying fragmenation, it does not have to support it." we return to this in our recommendations.

Finally, even internally, the Department of Political Science does not present the image of a unified whole. The Department has a history of internal squabbling and bickering. This resulted in a splitting of the Department into two -- Political Science and Public Administration -- but that split has not solved the problem. This internal strife has affected the image of the Department with the central administration and with other departments, and has absorbed scarce time and energy.

As might be expected from the above comments about bickering and internal strife, the level of morale in the Department is not high. In addition to their personal difficulties with each other, there is a perception of being poorly treated in relation to other departments in the College.

The Department currently operates two graduate programs at the M.A. level. One is a rather conventional masters program, but with an emphasis in comparative politics and international affairs, taught on the Tampa campus. The other M.A. program is a more specialized program with an international affairs focus offered at McDill Air Force Base.

It seems very unwise to offer these two separate programs. The Department has insufficient resources to offer two programs.

Finally, the research productivity of the Department of Political Science is low by almost any standard. Members of faculty complained about their work load but, although class size of undergraduate classes is large, the number of sections taught is no higher than in other SUS departments that have substantially higher levels of productivity.

Changes Within Existing Resources. Many of the issues cannot be addressed effectively at the departmental level. There are, however, a number of things that can and should be done at that level to minimize the problems within the unit. In several instances the suggestions offered may border on gratuitous advice, but still they are points that should be raised when considering the present and future condition of this department.

1. Eliminate One Graduate Program. The Department of Political Science presently is attempting to offer two separate graduate programs (Masters level) at two separate places. This does not appear desirable given the limited faculty resources of the Department, the numerous demands on their time, and the Department's stated desire to enhance research productivity.
2. Reduce Faculty Participation in Regional Campus Programs. Again, a principal problem in the Department and the College is the fragmentation of the faculty and programs on a number of different campuses. While the Department itself can do nothing about the underlying fragmentation, it does not have to support it. At present the Department is subsidizing the fragmentation by having its members travel to teach on an overload basis at the various regional campuses.
3. Differential Teaching and Improvements of Teaching. Given that the department does experience substantial demand for its courses, and that

it is generally considered a good teaching department, members of the Department who show no inclination for serious scholarly productivity should be assigned additional teaching responsibilities to help meet demand for coursework.

4. Establish Better Contact with Public Administration.

5. Channel Energy and Resources into Principal Teaching and Research Activities

6. Place a moratorium on discussions of Ph.D. Degrees. The Department of Political Science does not currently have the level of resources, or of research productivity, to justify thinking about a Ph.D. degree. Further, there are only a modest number of students in their M.A. program, and there is no evidence of substantial demand for a more advanced program. First, we believe, the department and the University need to get its own, current house in order.

7. Leadership. As implied above, a central mechanism for solving the problems of the department should be its leadership. There is an overwhelming need for a strong and effective leader for the department, and when possible such an individual should be recruited from outside the department.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We find, overall, a good set of political science programs at the undergraduate level and sometimes at the graduate level. Many of the departments have, or are developing, distinctive foci, in addition to their basic strengths, which will permit them to play a key role in institutional

specialties. All of the departments are particularly to be commended for their fine work with undergraduate programs. Truly, undergraduate education is a real strength in the system. While we believe that more effort needs to be put into thinking about the M.A. programs and the general education programs, we find strong faculty quality from which additional building can take place.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS

POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW
UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS

University of Florida
Dr. Wayne Francis
Professor and Chair
Dept. of Political Science

Florida A & M University
Dr. Keith C. Simmonds
Associate Professor
Dept. of History, Political Science and Economics

Florida Atlantic University
Dr. Douglas Gatlin
Professor
Dept. of Political Science

University of Central Florida
Dr. Joyce Lilie
Associate Professor & Chair
Dept. of POlitical Science

University of North Florida
Dr. John Plumlee
Associate Professor
Dept. of Political Science and Public Administration

Florida State University
Dr. Henry Glick
Professor
Dept. of Political Science

University of South Florida
Dr. Lewis Bowman
Professor
Dept. of Political Science

University of West Florida
Dr. James Witt
Professor and Chair
Dept of Political Science

Florida International University
Dr. Christopher L. Warren
Assistant Professor
Dept. of Political Science

APPENDIX B

LOCAL CONSULTANTS

99

POLITICAL SCIENCE PROGRAM REVIEW
LOCAL CONSULTANTS

University of Florida

Dr. Leroy N. Rieselbach
Department of Political Science
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Florida A & M University

Dr. James T. Jones
Department of Political Science
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30337

Florida Atlantic University

Dr. James E. Anderson
Department of Political Science
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas 77843

University of Central Florida

Dr. Ruth Jones
Department of Political Science
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85287

University of North Florida

Dr. Edward Greenberg
Chairman
Department of Political Science
Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado
Campus Box 487
Boulder, Colorado 80309

Florida State University

Dr. William Robertson Keech
Department of Political Science
CB#3265 Hamilton Hall
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3265

University of South Florida

Dr. Brainard Guy Peters
Department of Political Science
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

University of West Florida

Dr. Caleb M. Clark
Department of Political Science
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming 82070

Florida International University

Dr. James M. Malloy
Department of Political Science
University of Pittsburgh
4L27 Forbes Quadrangle
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvalnia 15260

APPENDIX C

SITE VISIT SCHEDULES

FLORIDA A & M UNIVERSITY
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
January 13, 1988

9:00 - 9:30	Disciplines focus within the university; availability of resources to programs in the discipline.	Dr. Frederick Humphries, President Dr. Richard A. Hogg, Vice President for Academic Affairs Foote-Hilyer Building
9:45 -10:15	Goals and objectives of disciplines and programs within college and departments	Dr. Aubry Perry, Dean College of Arts and the Sciences
10:20-11:20	Faculty and Consultants	Room 113, Tucker Hall
11:30-12:30	Lunch and Discussion (Consultants)	Room 113, Tucker Hall
1:00- 1:55	Department Chair & Coordinator	Room 113, Tucker Hall
2:00- 2:30	Alumni	Room 113, Tucker Hall
2:35- 3:00	Students	Room 113, Tucker Hall
3:15- 3:50	Consultant's Outline Review	
4:00- 5:00	Summary of Findings and Recommendations	President Humphries Vice President Hogg Dean Perry BOR Consultants Professor Simmonds Professor Rivers President's Conference Room, Foote-Hilyer Building

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
February 22, 1988

9:00-9:30	Introductory meeting with President Sliger, Vice President Turnbull, and Dean of Faculties Edward, 211 Westcott
9:45-10:30	Meet with Dean Cnudde and Political Science Chair Palmer, 130 Bellamy
10:30-11:15	Meet with Political Science Faculty, 511 Bellamy
11:15-11:45	Meet with Political Science and related program chairs (Professors Dye, Glick, Piccard, Ray and St. Angelo), 511 Bellamy
11:45-12:45	Working Lunch, Professors Keech and Lineberry
1:00-1:45	Meet with Undergraduate and Graduate Students, 511 Bellamy
1:45-2:15	Tour of Computer Facilities, Professor Dalton, 553 Bellamy
2:15-3:00	Tour of Strozier Library, Professor Vanderoef, 563 Bellamy
3:00-4:00	Professors Keech and Lineberry, working session, 511 Bellamy (or other available office)
4:15-5:00	Exit interview with Vice President Turnbull and Dean of Faculties Edwards, 212 Westcott

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
February 4, 1988

Lead Consultant:	Dr. Robert Lineberry Dean, College of Arts & Sciences University of Kansas
Local Consultant:	Dr. James E. Anderson Department of Political Science Texas A & M University
Board of Regents Staff:	Dr. James Ammons Department of Political Science Florida A & M University

8:40- 9:00	Meeting with Dr. Leonard Kooperman, School of Public Administration
9:00-10:30	Meeting with Dr. Dorothy Stetson, Chair; tour of campus
10:30-11:00	Meeting with Dr. Helen Popvich, President
11:00-11:30	Meeting with Dr. Leonard Berry, Vice-President for Academic Affairs
11:30-12:00	Meeting with Dr. Robert Huckshorn, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dr. Jeffrey S. Tennant, Vice-President for Graduate Studies and Research
12:00- 1:30	Lunch -- ADM 208
1:30- 2:00	Meeting with Dr. Ronald Schultz, Chair, Dept. of Geography
2:00- 2:30	Meeting with Dr. Robert C. Catlin, Dean, College of Social Science
2:30- 3:30	Meeting with faculty, Dept. of Political Science
3:30- 4:00	Break
4:00- 4:30	Exit interview with Dr. Leonard Berry, Vice-President for Academic Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
January 14, 1988

8:30- 9:00	President and/or Academic Vice President
9:00- 9:45	Dean and Chair (GJM Room)
9:45-10:00	Break
10:00-11:00	Chair and Political Science Faculty (GJM Room)
11:00-12:00	Alumni, Career Service, and Community College Staff (GJM Room)
12:00- 1:00	Lunch and Discussion (Consultants) (Nautilus Chamber)
1:00- 2:00	Cross Section of Students (Board Room)
2:00- 2:15	Break
2:15- 3:00	Tour Facilities
3:00- 4:00	Discuss Program (Consultants - Board Room)
4:00- 5:00	Academic Vice President (Summary of Findings and Recommendations - Board Room)

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
JANUARY 15, 1988

8:30 am	Pick-up at hotel
8:45 am	Academic Vice-President and President
10:00 am	PS&S Chair/A&S Dean
10:30 am	PS faculty--group meeting
11:45 am	PS students and FCCJ representative
12:30 pm	Working lunch
2:30 pm	Optional library tour
3:00 pm	Exit interview (view videotape)
4:00 pm	Depart

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
FEBRUARY 5, 1988

8:30- 9:00 PC 526	-Priority of program discipline within university and availability of resources to program. -Relationship of program to goals of University. -Aspirations for program.	Provost, Judith Stiehm; Chair, John Stack.
9:00- 9:45 DM 445 (conf. rm.)	-Goals and objectives of program within the college. -Program Structure/Administration -Faculty characteristics & needs. -State & national issues affecting discipline/program. -Aspirations for program	Dean, James Mau; Acting Dean of Graduate Studies, Richard Campbell; Assoc. Dean, A&S, Luis Escovar; Chair, John Stack.
9:45-10:00	-Break	
10:00-11:15	-(Two meetings, simultaneously).	
1. DM 223	-Curriculum evaluation. -Faculty characteristics. (scholarship, teaching, services). -North Campus (Goals, strengths, challenges). -Adequacy of resources.	Department faculty; R. Lineberry or J. Malloy.
2. DM 445 (conf.rm.)	-Relationships with other programs in institution (Institutes, Departments, LACC, MIS, etc.). -Relations with Miami Dade Comm. College	T. Maingot (Soc./ Ant.); P. Cistone (Education); J. Alexiou (MDCC); R. Clem (INR) Janet Parker (Lib. St.); Jack Parker Env. St.); D. Kincaid (LACC); R. Lineberry or J. Malloy.
11:15-12:00 DM 140	-Extrinsic value of program. -Graduates' movement into professions.	Alumni
12:00-1:00 DM 445 (conf. rm.)	-Lunch and discussion.	Consultants only

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
(Continued)

1:00- 2:00	-(Two meetings simultaneously).	
1. DM 445	-Student characteristics. -Demand for program and availability to students. -Admissions, retention, completion. -Indicators of student performance. -Review of type of work assigned & indicators of quality.	Department faculty and R. Lineberry.
2. DM 140	-Interviews with students.	Students & J. Malloy.
2:00- 2:30 DM 484 (Pol. Sci Dept.)	-Tour Campus & Facilities (Library, Computers, LACC).	Mark Volcansek; Mark Rosenberg.
2:30- 3:00 DM 445 (conf. rm.)	-Discussion of Program -Outlining of Report	Consultants only.
3:00- 3:30 PC 526	-Summary of findings and preliminary recommendations.	President Modesto Madique; Provost, Judith Stiehm; Dean, James Mau; Chair, John Stack.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
February 23, 1988

9:00-10:00 Meeting with Department Chair and Policy Committee
General policy questions relating to curriculum, faculty composition and recruitment, program growth and diversity, resources, etc.

10:00-11:00 Meeting with Academic Dean(s) including Dean of Graduate Studies and Department Chair.

Discussion of goals and objectives of discipline, programs and programmanagement, faculty characteristics, state and national issues affecting discipline.

11:00-11:45 Meeting with Undergraduate Committee

Discussion of Curriculum, enrollments, career needs, resources market conditions for employment, etc.

11:45-1:00 Lunch and Discussion of Programs. Consultants only.

1:00-2:00 Meeting with Students

2:00-3:00 Meeting with Graduate Committee & Directors or Representatives of Programs

Discussion of program goals, placement of students, growth and market factors, needs and resources, curriculum, etc.

3:00-4:00 Discussion of Programs. Consultants only.

4:00-5:00 Meeting with Academic Vice-President and Provost, Robert Bryan

Summary of Findings and preliminary recommendaitons for university.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
February 24, 1988

Participants: Dr. Robert Lineberry, University of Kansas
Dr. Ruth Jones, Arizona State University
Dr. Jaems Ammons, Faculty Program Consultant

9:00 Group Meeting with Faculty who work in the area of American Politics
Curriculum and course offerings; research and publications; other faculty concerns. Drs. Hutch Polloc, Barbara Perry and Elliot Vittes (HFA 516)

9:30 President Trevor Colbourn, Provost Richard Astro and Vice President Frank Juge
University goals and relationship of Political Science to those goals; academic quality of Political Science program and faculty; resources and program management, other academic concerns. (Presidential Suite)

10:30 Group meeting with faculty who work in the area of American Politics and Political Theory
Curriculum, course offerings and student matters; research and publication; other faculty concerns Drs. Robert Bledsoe, Henry Kennedy, Joan Johnson-Freese and Waltraud Morales (HFA 516)

11:30 Dr. Jack Rollins, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Program quality, goals, resources, management. Role of Political Science in general education program, undergraduate program, graduate program (HFA 509)

12:00 Working Lunch
Drs. Ammons, Jones, Lineberry
HFA 516 (Lunch will be brought in)

1:00 Dr. William Prentiss, Chair Department of Social Science, Valencia Community College, Relationships and articulation between UCF and community colleges, with specific reference to Political Science. (HFA 516)

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
SITE VISIT SCHEDULE
February 25, 1988

Participants:

Robert Lineberry, Dean
College of Liberal
University of Kansas

B. Guy Peters
Maurice Falk Professor of American Government
University of Pittsburgh

BOR staff

Schedule:

9:00 - 9:30	Meeting with Francis Borkowski, President
9:30 -10:00	Meeting with James Anker, Acting Provost and David Schenck, Acting Vice Provost
10:00-10:15	Break
10:15-11:00	Meeting with: Julia Davis, Dean Ed Silbert, Associate Dean College of Social and Behavioral Sciences George R. Newkome, Associate Provost for Graduate School and Research
11:00-12:00	Meetings with alumni, employees, etc.
12:00- 1:00	Lunch (consultants and BOR staff only)
1:00 - 2:00	Consultations J. Edwin Benton, Chair Harry Vanden, Graduate Coordinator Arthur Levy, Undergraduate Coordinator Department Advisory Committee Students (Pre-Law Society, Graduate Student Association, Pi Sigma Alpha, graduate assistants)
2:00 - 2:15	Break
2:15 - 3:00	Tour of library, labs, research facilities
3:00 - 4:00	Consultants only
4:00 - 5:00	Exit meeting with James Anker, Acting Provost

APPENDIX D

DEGREE INVENTORY

ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS INVENTORY
CURRENT THROUGH JANUARY 1988

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND GOVERNMENT (2207)

CIP CODE	UF	FSU	FAMU	USF	FAU	UWF	UCF	FIU	UNF
45.1001	B M D	B M D	B	B M	B M	B	B M	B	B

B Bachelor Degree
M Master Degree
D Doctoral Degree (Ph.D. or Ed.D)

APPENDIX E

DEGREE PRODUCTIVITY

POLITICAL SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT (2207)
DEGREES GRANTED

	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86
University of Florida					
Bachelors	146	231	196	212	212
Masters	17	18	16	14	19
Doctors	2	2		1	1
Professional					
Total					
Florida State University					
Bachelors	128	142	153	162	160
Masters	6	5	4	2	2
Doctors	10	11	6	2	6
Professional					
Total					
Florida A&M University					
Bachelors	37	14	30	27	37
Masters					
Doctors					
Professional					
Total					
University of South Florida					
Bachelors	113	149	106	109	119
Masters	3	4	2	2	1
Doctors					
Professional					
Total					
Florida Atlantic University					
Bachelors	19	16	33	23	27
Masters				1	
Doctors					
Professional					
Total					
University of West Florida					
Bachelors	18	15	14	10	16
Masters	1	2		1	2
Doctors					
Professional					
Total					

POLITICAL SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT (2207)
DEGREES GRANTED (cont.)

	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86
University of Central Florida					
Bachelors	47	57	43	55	58
Masters	4	4	2	3	3
Doctors					
Professional					
Total					
Florida International University					
Bachelors	32	47	19	40	35
Masters					
Doctors					
Professional					
Total					
University of North Florida					
Bachelors	27	14	8	12	16
Masters					
Doctors					
Professional					
Total					
SUS Totals					
Bachelors	567	685	602	650	680
Masters	31	33	24	23	27
Doctors	2	13	6		1

APPENDIX F

VITA

VITA

Robert L. Lineberry

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045
913/864-3661

August, 1987

321 Settlers Drive
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
913/841-2799

Personal: Born May 4, 1942 in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: married, two children

Education: B.A., University of Oklahoma, 1964
Ph.D., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1969

Administrative Position:

University of Kansas, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, 1981-present. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is an integrated college, including faculties and programs in the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. It includes about 500 faculty members, 700 teaching assistants, 14,000 undergraduate students and more than 2000 graduate students. Its FY 1987 budget is $30 million. In addition to its regular departments and programs, it maintains supporting programs in Applied English, Word Processing, a language and computation laboratory, the College Honors Program, the Office of Study Abroad, and Supportive Educational Services.

Several activities of note:

a. assisted faculty in developing new general education curriculum in the College, requiring non-western culture courses and reducing "distribution electives" from 1800 to 120, effective Fall, 1987; convened evaluation project on impact of this new curriculum;

b. undergraduate enrollment of the College increased from 10,000 in Fall, 1981 to 14,000 in Fall, 1987;

c. worked with staff in development of ARTS (Academic Requirements Tracking System) program, a computerized, individualized requirements system for assistance in advising and graduation;

d. assisted in National Endowment for the Humanities Challenge Grant program, which eventually raised $6 million for the University;

e. began biannual newspaper from the College to all junior and senior high school teachers in the State and started summer workshops for high school teachers.

f. coordinating College portion of "Campaign Kansas" capital fund drive.

Academic Positions:

University of Kansas, Professor of Political Science 1981-present.
Northwestern University, Associate Professor, 1974-76 and Professor, 1976-81 of Political Science and Urban Affairs.
University of Texas at Austin, Assistant Professor, 1967-1971 and Associate Professor of Government, 1971-1974.
Academic Visitor, University of Kent at Canterbury, Spring, 1979.

Professional Activities:

Advisory Panel for Political Science, National Science Foundation, 1974-1976.
Section Chair, panels on subnational politics, Midwest Political Science Association, 1975.
Section Chair, panels on public policy, Midwest Political Science Association, 1977.
Chair, Gladys M. Kammerer Award Committee, American Political Science Association, 1979.
President, Policy Studies organization, 1981-82.
Board of Directors, Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, 1983-84; 1986-89.

Editorial Positions:

Co-Editor, Urban Affairs Quarterly, 1980-81; Associate Editor, 1975-80.
Deputy Editor, Social Science Quarterly, 1972-84.
Editorial Boards: Am. Journal of Pol. Science, 1974-78.
Law and Policy Quarterly, 1978-80.
The Urban Interest, 1978-80.
Political Geography Quarterly, 1981--.
Social Science Quarterly, 1984--.
Literature Review Co-Editor, Policy Studies Journal & Policy Studies Review, 1985-87.

University Activities:

University of Texas, Austin:
Member, Executive Committee, Department of Government, 1968-69, 1872-74.
Placement Advisory, 1969-71.
Chairman, Faculty Recruitment Committee, 1971-72.
Member, Black Studies Director Search Committee, 1971-73.
Research Associate, LBJ School of Public Affairs, 1973-74.
Chairman, Student Living Accommodations Committee, 1973-74.

Northwestern University, Evanston:
Member, Executive Committee, Center for Urban Affairs, 1974-80.
Graduate Placement Advisor, 1975-77
Director, Program in Urban Studies, College of Arts and Sciences, 1976-78.
Chairman, Henry R. Luce Professorship Search Committee, 1979-80.
Chairman, Faculty Planning Committee, 1980-81.
Member, Provost's Budget Advisory Committee, 1980-81.

University of Kansas, Lawrence:
Academic Council, 1981--.
Video Subcommittee of the Telecommunications Committee, 1982-85.
Academic Computing Center Advisory Committee, 1983--.
Dean of Education Search Committee, 1985-86.
Chancellor's Task Force on the University and Economic Development, 1986-87.
Chair, KU United Fund Committee, 1986-87.

Publications:

Books:

Urban Politics and Public Policy. New York: Harper & Row. First edition, 1971; Second edition, 1974; Third edition, 1978 (with Ira Sharkansky).

Equality and Urban Policy: The Distribution of Municipal Services. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1977.

American Public Policy: What Government Does and What Difference It Makes. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Aftermath: The Social and Economic Impact of Natural Disasters on Communities. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage, 1979 (with Paul Friesema, James Caporaso, Gerald Goldstein, and Richard McCleary).

Government in America: People, Politics and Policy. Boston: Little, Brown, 1980; 2nd ed. 1983; 3rd ed., 1986; 4th ed. (in preparation)

Governing States and Cities (in preparation; with Virginia Gray).

Edited Books:

Readings in the Politics of American Democracy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969 (co-edited with Marian D. Irish and James W. Prothro).

Community Politics: A Behavioral Approach. New York: The Free Press, 1971 (co-edited with Charles Bonjean and Terry N. Clark).

Urban Problems and Public Policy. Lexington, Mass. Ballinger, 1976 (co-edited with Louis H. Masotti).

Social Science in America: The First Two Hundred Years. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976 (with Charles M. Bonjean and Louis Schneider).

The Politics and Economics of Urban Services. Beverly Hills, Ca: Sage, 1978.

Crime in City Politics. New York: Longman, 1983 (with Ann Heinz and Herbert Jacob).

Monographs:

"The Last of the Great Urban Machines and the Last of the Great Urban Mayors: Chicago Politics 1955-77," with Kathleen Kemp, Northwestern University Center for Urban Affairs, 1979.

"Governmental Responses to Crime." report to U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1982; 3 volumes. (With Herbert Jacob and others).

Articles in Books:

"Approaches to the Study of Community Politics," in Bonjean, Clark, and Lineberry, op. cit.

"The Comparative Analysis of Urban Policy: Canada and the United States," in Harlan Hahn (ed.), People and Politics in Urban Society. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage, 1972 (with Edmund P. Fowler).

"Patterns of Feedback in City Politics," in David Morgan and Samuel Kirkpatrick (eds.), Urban Political Analysis. New York: The Free Press, 1972 (with Edmund P. Fowler).

"Comparative Policy Analysis and the Problem of Reciprocal Causation," in Craig Liske, William Loehr, and John McCamant (eds.), Comparative Public Policy: Issues, Theory, and Method. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage, 1975 (with Edmund P. Fowler).

"The Case of the Wrangling Professors," in Alan Clem (ed.), The Making of Congressmen. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury, 1976. (With J. Sinclair, L. Dodd, and A. Sager).

"The Policy Impact of Policy Evaluation: Some Implications of the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment," in John A. Gardiner (ed.), Public Law and Public Policy. New York: Praeger, 1977 (with Neal Milner and Jeff Henig).

"The Politics of Police Responses to Urban Crime," in Dan A. Lewis (ed.), Reactions to Crime. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981 (with Janice A. Beecher and Michael J. Rich).

"Politicians and Urban Policy Change: The Case of Crime," in Terry N. Clark (ed.), Urban Political Analysis: Directions for Future Research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1981 (with Stephen C. Brooks).

"The Last of the Great Urban Machines and the Last of the Great Urban Mayors? Chicago Politics, 1955-77," in Samuel K. Gove and Louis H. Masotti (ed.), After Daley: Chicago Politics in Transition. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1982 (with Kathleen A. Kemp). Translated into Japanese, 1985.

Articles in Journals

"Reformism and Public Policies in American Cities," American Political Science Review 61, September, 1967, 701-716 (with Edmund Fowler). Selected in 1982 as a "Citation Classic" by Social Sciences Citation Index.

"Community Structure and Planning Commitment: A Note on the Correlates of Agency Expenditures." Social Science Quarterly 49, December, 1969, 423-430.

"Reforming Metropolitan Governance: Requiem or Reality," Georgetown Law Journal 58, March-May, 1970, 675-717.

"The Urbanization-Party Competition Hypothesis: A Comparison of All United States Counties," Journal of Politics 32, May, 1970, 305-321 (with Charles M. Bonjean).

"Size-of-Place Analysis: Another Reconsideration," Western Political Quarterly 24, December, 1971, 713-718 (with Charles M. Bonjean).

"Who Gets What: Measuring Distribution of Urban Services," Social Science Quarterly 54, March, 1974, 700-712 (with Robert C. Welch).

"Mandating Urban Equality: The Distribution of Municipal Public Services," Texas Law Review 53, December 1974, 26-59.

"Suburbia and the Metropolitan Turf," The Annals 422, November, 1975, 1-9.

"Equality, Public Policy, and Public Services: The Underclass Hypothesis and the Limits to Equality," Politics and Policy 4, December, 1975, 67-84.

"Community Structure and Leadership Arrangements: A Multi-Dimensional Analysis," American Sociological Review 41, August, 1976, 701-725 (with M. Grimes, C. Bonjean, and L. Lyons).

"Who is getting What? Measuring Urban Service Outputs," Public Management, August, 1976, 13-18.

"Policy Analysis and Urban Government: Understanding the Impact," Journal of Urban Analysis 5, 1978, 1-11.

"Reform, Representation, and Policy," Social Science Quarterly, 59, June, 1978, 173-77.

"The Decline and Fall of the Daley Empire," Arts and Sciences, Fall, 1979.

"Neighborhoods, Politics, and Public Services: The Case of Chicago," The Urban Interest 2, Spring, 1980, 11-18 (with Sharon Watson).

"Political Power, the Urban Agenda, and Crime Policies," Social Science Quarterly 62, December, 1981, 630-643 (with Janice A. Beecher and Michael J. Rich).

"Politicians and the Distribution of Public Policies," Policy Studies Review, 4, February, 1985, 407-412.

"Urban Affairs: A Look into the Past and the Future," Urban Affairs Quarterly 21, September 1985, 20-24.

Papers Presented at Professional Conferences:

"Urbanization and Inter-Party Competition: An Analysis of All United States Counties," with Charles M. Bonjean, a paper presented at the Southwestern Social Science Association, April 2-5, 1969.

"Canadian City Politics: Public Policy Analysis and the Problem of Reciprocal Causation," American Political Science Association, September 2-6, 1969 (with Edmund P. Fowler).

"Public Policy as an Independent and Dependent Variable," American Society for Public Administration, Philadelphia, April 608, 1970.

"Measuring the Distribution of Urban Services," American Political Science Association, September 4-8, 1973 (with Rod Welch).

"Public Policy and the Problem of Reciprocal Causation," University of Denver, November 20-23, 1978 (with Edmund P. Fowler).

"Toward a Structural Theory of Urban Policy," Conference on Comparative Urban Policy, Bellagio, Italy, June 20-24, 1975 (with E. P. Fowler).

"Equality, Public Policy, and Public Services: The Underclass Hypothesis and the Limits to Equality," American Political Science Association, San Francisco, CA, September 2-5, 1975.

"The Policy Impact of Policy Evaluation: Some Implications of the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment," Midwest Political Science Association, April 29 - May 1, 1976 (with Jeff Henig and Neal Milner).

"The Increasingly Dependent City," Symposium on Application of Dependency Theory, Northwestern University, September 22-23, 1976.

"On the Inside Looking Out: Public Policy and External Determinants," American Political Science Association, September 1-4, 1977 (with J. Henig and N. Milner).

"Public Services and Economic Growth," paper presented at conference on "Alternatives to Confrontation: A National Policy Toward Regional Change," University of Texas and Lyndon B. Johnson Library, September 24-27, 1977.

"What Difference Does It Make? Chicago Politics After Daley," Conference on Richard J. Daley's Chicago, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, October 12-14, 1977 (with K. Kemp).

"Policy Analysis and Urban Governments: Understanding the Impacts," Conference on Policy Analysis in State and Local Government, Stony Brook, New York, May 22-24, 1977.

"The Last of the Great Machines and the Last of the Great Urban Mayors? Chicago Politics, 1955-77," Southwestern Social Science Association, Houston, TX, April 12-15, 1978 (with Kathleen Kemp).

"New Wine in Old Paradigms: In Search of Theory and Data in the Study of Urban Politics," Conference on Comparative Urban Policy Research, University of Chicago, April 26-27, 1979.

"Policy Research, Teaching, and Government: A Political Science Perspective," Symposium on Teaching Public Policy, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida, March 5-7, 1980.

"Mayoral Transitions and Crime Rates: A Study of Ten American Cities, 1948-78," Law and Society Association,, Madison, Wisconsin, June 5-8, 1980 (with Stephen C. Brooks).

"Crime, Politics, and the Policy Agenda: American Cities, 1948-78," Conference of the Association of Public Policy and Management, Boston, MA, September 25-27, 1980 (with Herbert Jacob).

"Political Responses to Urban Crime," Midwest Political Science Association, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 16-18, 1980 (with Janice Beecher and Michael Rich).

"Policy Analysis, Policy Science, and Political Science," American Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, September, 1983.

"Politics, Economics, Majorities and the Constitution," conference on "Political Economy of the Constitution," Florida State University, March 5-8, 1987.

"Politics, Policy and the New Biology," address, Missouri-Kansas Political Science Association, October 17, 1987.

Journal Issues Edited:

"Urban Problems and Policies," Social Science Quarterly 52, December, 1971, with C. M. Bonjean and N. D. Glenn.

"Symposium on Urban Policy," Policy Studies Journal 3, Summer, 1975, with Louis H Masotti.

"The Social Sciences in America: The First 200 Years," Social Science Quarterly 57, June, 1976, with C. Bonjean and L. Schneider.

"The Politics and Economics of Urban Services," Urban Affairs Quarterly 13, March, 1977.

Research Grants:

National Science Foundation, "Sociospatial Distribution of Urban Public Policies," 1972, $16,000.

National Science Foundation (RANN), "Social and Economic Consequences of Natural Disasters," 1975-76, $136,350, (Co-principal investigator; Principal investigator: H. P. Friesema).

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, "Governmental Responses to Crime: 1948-78," $922,000, 1978-81 (Co-principal investigator; Principal investigator: H. Jacob).

Teaching:

Graduate Teaching: Public Policy; Political Structure of the Urban Community; American Politics (20 consecutive years teaching freshman American government).

Undergraduate Teaching: American Government and Politics; Community Politics; Public Policy; Chicago Politics.

Honors, Listings, etc.

Faculty Honor Roll for teaching excellence, Northwestern University, 1977-78, 1978-79.

Contemporary Authors

Who's Who in the Midwest

Listed as one of the 20 most-cited political scientists in the areas of public policy, public administration and public law, PS Summer, 1986, p. 658.

Academic References: Available upon request.